FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
AND
FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE
MISSION PLANNING CENTER PARK
(PELICAN PIER AND SEAWALL)
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

Agency: United States Air Force (USAF), Headquarters, Air Mobility Command

Background: Pursuant to the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500-1508, as they implement the requirements of the National Environment Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 U.S.C. § 4321, et seq., and the Air Force Instruction, Environmental Impact Analysis Process, as promulgated at 32 CFR Part 989, the U.S. Air Force conducted an assessment of the potential environmental consequences associated with implementation of the following proposed action: to demolish the existing pier and construct a new pier and seawall in its place. The environmental assessment considered all potential impacts of the proposed action and alternatives, both as solitary actions and in conjunction with other proposed activities. The Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) summarizes the results of the evaluation of the proposed action and alternatives. The discussion focuses on activities that have the potential to change both the natural and human environments. The Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) summarizes the options considered and why the proposed pier and seawall was designed and sited as proposed.

Proposed Action: Demolition of the existing pier and seawall which is currently derelict and deteriorating, and the construction of a new pier with a reduced seawall to create a functional and aesthetically-pleasing facility which will compliment the newly constructed Mission Planning Center.

Alternatives: Two alternatives to the proposed action were evaluated during the environmental impact analysis process. The Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative would involve the demolition of the existing seawall and piers, and replacement with identical structures, including approximately 650 feet of seawall, 650 feet of dock parallel to the seawall, and two piers of approximately 200 feet in length. The No-Action Alternative that would involve no construction or demolition activities and no changes to the current, unsafe pier structure. The environmental assessment process identified the proposed action as the preferred course of action since it would best suit the needs of the base and, if implemented properly, would not result in significant environmental impacts. The environmental consequences associated with implementation of the proposed action are summarized in the following sections.

Air Quality: Fugitive dust and construction vehicle exhaust will be generated during the demolition of the existing pier and the construction of a new pier. However, these emissions will not constitute a major source of air pollutants based on quantitative analyses of particulate matter and vehicle emissions generated by projects of similar size and scope. The estimated values for

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1. REPORT DATE	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED
13 AUG 2003	**Environmental Assessment**	**00-00-2000 to 00-00-2003**

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
Environmental Assessment Mission Planning Center Park (Pelican Pier and Seawall), MacDill Air Force Base, Florida	5b. GRANT NUMBER
	5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S)	5d. PROJECT NUMBER
	5e. TASK NUMBER
	5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) **United States Air Force,MacDill Air Force Base,Tampa,FL,33621**	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
Environmental Assessment Mission Planning Center Park (Pelican Pier and Seawall), MacDill Air Force Base, Florida

15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT **unclassified**	b. ABSTRACT **unclassified**	c. THIS PAGE **unclassified**	**Same as Report (SAR)**	**105**	

carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOC), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), sulfur oxides (SO_x), and particulate matter (PM_{10}) were determined to be less than USEPA *de minimis* values. and less than 10% of the Hillsborough County emissions inventory, and therefore, an air conformity analysis is not necessary. The proposed action will not have a significant impact on air quality in this region.

Noise: Noise levels will increase temporarily during construction, particularly for occupants of nearby facilities in the Staff Historic District. Based on an average construction noise level of 85 decibels (dB) at 50 feet from the point of generation, noise levels at the pier could rise above the 65 dB level during construction and demolition, respectively. However, the increased noise levels will not be continuous and it is believed that the work force at the Staff Historic District will accept the temporary increase in noise since they will benefit from the project.

Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuels: A temporary increase in the generation of solid waste will occur during demolition of the existing facility and construction of the new pier and seawall. The presence of lead-based paint and asbestos-containing building materials has not been evaluated at the facility. Base engineering considers any building constructed prior to 1981 as likely containing asbestos, which would need to be removed by a licensed asbestos contractor in accordance with all federal, state and local guidelines. Notwithstanding, as the Pier is primarily constructed of unpainted pressure treated lumber, relatively little, if any, asbestos-containing building materials and/or lead-based paints above applicable action levels are expected. However, in the event any suspect materials are encountered, base Bio-Environmental Engineering will be immediately contacted, and appropriate testing and precautions will be taken. Assuming these precautions are followed, the proposed action will not result in significant impacts from hazardous materials or wastes. There will be no impacts to stored fuels with implementation of the proposed action.

Water Resources: There will be no significant impacts to surface or ground water quality during construction of the pier, or as a result of demolition of the existing structures.

Floodplains: Construction of the new pier and seawall, and demolition of the existing structures, will be mostly above the high-tide line of Tampa Bay, and take place entirely within the 100-year coastal floodplain on the northeastern portion of the base. Currently, 80% of MacDill AFB is located within the coastal floodplain. The 20% of the installation that is not located within the floodplain is primarily being used for airfield operations and support. Consequently, there are no construction sites available on the installation that are above the coastal floodplain and are situated with direct access to Tampa Bay. The construction and demolition site are located in the floodplain. This factual situation leads to the conclusion that there is no practicable alternative (as defined in Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management) to constructing the new pier in the coastal floodplain on the base.

All practicable measures to minimize the impact of floods on human health, safety, and welfare, and preserve the natural values of the floodplains will be implemented for the project. The project will not involve discharges of hazardous or sanitary wastewater to the floodplain or Tampa Bay. No contaminated fill will be produced during construction. There will be no negative impacts on floodplain functions and values or threats to human life, health, and safety.

Biological Resources: Adverse impacts on wetlands will not occur during the demolition of the existing structure or during construction of the new pier and seawall. The proposed action could impact aquatic life in the surface water of Tampa Bay. The proposed construction work to repair the pier pilings will disturb bottom sediments and increase water turbidity. Increased turbidity can impact aquatic plant life by reducing the penetration of sunlight, which over an extended period, can kill aquatic plants, especially sea grasses which are common in the shallow areas throughout Tampa Bay. There are currently no sea-grass beds in the immediate vicinity of the pier, presumably due to the deep water and historic dredging activities around the pier. The construction methods outlined for the proposed action would reduce turbidity impacts by installing turbidity-control barriers around the entire perimeter of the approach pier and seawall. The turbidity-control structures will keep the turbid water contained within the work area, and eliminate water quality impacts outside of the immediate vicinity of the pier and seawall.

The repairs to the pilings will also impact aquatic animal life by eradicating the mini-ecosystems that exist on the wood pilings. The pilings are covered with barnacles and other sea life that the shellfish and fish in the area feed on and depend on for subsistence. Over time however, the barnacles and sea life will establish themselves on the new pilings, and the mini-ecosystem would be rebuilt.

The area of the proposed pier is subject to intermittent visits from the West Indian Manatee (*Trichechus manatus*). A Manatee Protection Plan will be implemented during site construction.

No other federal or state-listed species or species-critical habitat is present at the proposed construction and demolition sites or will be impacted by the project. Coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been completed to insure compliance with the Endangered Species Act and confirm that the project will have no impact on listed species.

Socioeconomic Resources: Demolition of the existing structures and construction of a new pier and seawall will have a minor short-term economic benefit for the Tampa community.

Cultural Resources: There will be a no impact to cultural resources with demolition of the existing Pelican Pier facility.

Land Use: The proposed action will result in no change to the existing land use. This alternative is consistent with current land-use planning on the installation.

Transportation Systems: Demolition of the existing structures and construction of a new pier and seawall will have a short-term, minor adverse impact on the transportation systems at MacDill AFB, but the impact will be temporary and is not considered significant.

Airspace/Airfield Operations: Implementation of the proposed action will not impact airspace/airfield operations.

Safety and Occupational Health: Demolition of the existing structures and construction of a new pier and seawall will not pose safety hazards beyond those typically experienced with a construction project or operation of a pier. Pelican Pier is not located on an identified Installation Restoration Program site, and excavation activities are not anticipated to encounter contaminated soil. The presence of lead-based paint and asbestos-containing building materials has not been evaluated at the facility. Base engineering considers any building constructed prior to 1981 as likely containing asbestos, which would need to be removed by a licensed asbestos contractor in accordance with all federal, state and local guidelines. Notwithstanding, as Pelican Pier is primarily constructed of unpainted pressure treated lumber, relatively little, if any, asbestos-containing building materials and/or lead-based paints above applicable action levels are expected. However, in the event any suspect materials are encountered, base Bio-Environmental Engineering will be immediately contacted, and appropriate testing and precautions will be taken. Implementing this approach will greatly reduce the potential for health and safety impacts to construction workers. If these precautions are implemented as described, the proposed action will not have a significant impact on safety and occupational health.

Environmental Management (including Geology and Soils): An operational Pelican Pier facility will participate in base recycling programs to reduce solid waste disposal volumes. The proposed action includes one small restroom, but this will not significantly impact the potable water or sanitary sewer system on base. During construction and demolition activities, soil erosion in disturbed areas will be controlled by implementation of a sediment and erosion control plan as well as best management practices.

Environmental Justice: No disproportionately high or adverse effects on minority or low-income populations will occur as a result of the demolition of the existing structures and construction of a new pier and seawall.

Indirect and Cumulative Impacts: There are no site-specific direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts associated with the demolition of the existing structures and construction of a new pier and seawall. The construction and demolition activities of the proposed action were considered in conjunction with other on going or planned construction projects, and found that together they do not constitute a significant cumulative impact.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: There are no unavoidable significant impacts associated with the demolition of the existing structures and construction of a new pier and seawall.

Relationship Between Short-term Uses and Enhancement of Long-term Productivity: Implementation of the proposed action will have a positive effect on long-term productivity by providing MacDill AFB with a new, permanent, landing/docking facility on the east side of the base that can support the installation mission, eliminate a known safety hazard, provides needed improvements to the Mission Planning Center Park, and improve recreational opportunities for installation residents.

Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources: The construction and demolition activities of the proposed action will irreversibly commit fuels, manpower, and costs related to constructing a useable facility for the installation.

Florida Coastal Zone Management: In accordance with the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) and the Florida CZMA, this federal action must be consistent, "to the maximum extent practicable," with the Florida Coastal Management Program (CMP). Appendix A to the EA contains the Air Force's Consistency Statement and finds that the conceptual proposed action and alternative plans presented in the EA are consistent with Florida's CMP. In accordance with Florida statutes, the Air Force has submitted a copy of the attached EA to the State of Florida so that they can perform a coastal zone consistency evaluation.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT: Based upon my review of the facts, and analyses contained in the attached Environmental Assessment, which is hereby incorporated by reference, I conclude that implementation of the proposed action will not have a significant environmental impact, either by itself or cumulatively, with other projects at MacDill AFB. Accordingly, the requirements of NEPA, the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality and the Air Force are fulfilled, and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The Tampa Tribune published a Notice of Availability on July 7, 2003. No comments were received during the public comment period ending August 8, 2003. The signing of this combined Finding of No Significant Impact and Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONSI/FONPA) completes the environmental impact analysis process under Air Force regulations.

FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE: Pursuant to Executive Order 11988, the authority delegated in Secretary of the Air Force Order (SAFO) 791.1, and taking the above information into account, I find that there is no practicable alternative to construction of the new Pelican Pier at this site. The alternatives to construction of a new pier are either cost prohibitive or impractical since the existing pier site has already been dredged to create an area of deeper water. Since construction of a pier on MacDill AFB is required, and since all land available for construction of a facility of this nature is within a coastal floodplain, there is no practicable alternative to building the facility within a floodplain. The proposed action, as designed, includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the coastal floodplain. The Air Force has sent all required notices to federal agencies, single points of contact, the State of Florida, local government representatives, and the local news media.

JOHN R. BAKER
Lieutenant General, USAF
Vice Commander

13 Aug 2003
DATE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

DEMOLISH/RE-CONSTRUCT PELICAN PIER AND SEAWALL MACDILL AFB, FLORIDA

Prepared for:

MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE
Tampa, Florida

May 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1.0 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION 5
1.1 Mission 5
1.2 Purpose of and Need for Proposed Action 6
1.3 Location of Proposed Action 6
1.4 The Scope of the Environmental Review 6
1.5 Applicable Regulatory Requirements 7
1.6 Coastal Zone Consistency Determination 8

SECTION 2.0 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 9
2.1 Selection Criteria 10
2.2 Detailed Description of the Proposed Action 10
2.3 Description of the Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative 11
2.4 Description of the No-Action Alternative 12
2.5 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Study 12
2.6 Identification of the Preferred Alternative 12
2.7 Identification of the Environmentally Preferred Alternative 12
2.8 Other Activities in the Area 13
2.9 Comparison of environmental effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives 13

SECTION 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT 15
3.1 Air Quality 16
3.1.1 Attainment Status 17
3.1.2 Baseline Air Emissions 18
3.1.3 State Regulations 19
3.2 Noise 20
3.3 Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuel 20
3.3.1 Wastes 20
3.3.2 Hazardous Materials 21
3.3.3 Stored Fuel 21
3.4 Water Resources 22
3.4.1 Surface Water 22
3.4.2 Groundwater 22
3.5 Floodplains 23
3.6 Biological Resources 24
3.6.1 Vegetative Communities 24
3.6.2 Wetlands 24
3.6.3 Wildlife 25
3.6.4 Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Species 26
3.7 Socioeconomics 28
3.8 Cultural Resources 28
3.8.1 Prehistoric Resources 29

3.8.2 Historic Resources 29
3.9 Land Use 30
3.10 Transportation 30
3.11 Airspace and Airfield Operations 31
3.12 Accident Potential 31
3.13 Safety and Occupational Health 31
3.13.1 Asbestos 31
3.13.2 Lead-Based Paint 32

SECTION 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 33
4.1 Air Quality 33
4.1.1 Proposed Action 33
4.1.1.1 Air Conformity Analysis 35
4.1.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative 36
4.1.3 No-Action Alternative 37
4.1.4 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts 37
4.2 Noise 37
4.2.1 Proposed Action 38
4.2.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative 39
4.2.3 No-Action Alternative 39
4.2.4 Cumulative Noise Impacts 39
4.3 Wastes, Hazardous Material, and Stored Fuel 40
4.3.1 Proposed Action 40
4.3.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative 41
4.3.3 No-Action Alternative 41
4.4 Water Resources 41
4.4.1 Proposed Action 41
4.4.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative 42
4.4.3 No-Action Alternative 42
4.5 Floodplains 42
4.5.1 Proposed Action 42
4.5.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative 43
4.5.3 No-Action Alternative 43
4.6 Biological Resources 43
4.6.1 Proposed Action 43
4.6.1.1 Wetlands 43
4.6.1.2 Listed Species Habitat 44
4.6.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative 45
4.6.3 No Action Alternative 45
4.7 Socioeconomics 45
4.7.1 Proposed Action 45
4.7.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative 45
4.7.3 No-Action Alternative 46
4.8 Cultural Resources 46
4.8.1 Proposed Action 46

4.8.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative....46
4.8.3 No-Action Alternative....46
4.9 Land Use....46
4.9.1 Proposed Action....46
4.9.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative....46
4.9.3 No-Action Alternative....47
4.10 Transportation....47
4.10.1 Proposed Action....47
4.10.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative....47
4.10.3 No-Action Alternative....47
4.11 Airspace/Airfield Operations and Bird-Aircraft Strike Hazard....47
4.12 Safety and Occupational Health....48
4.12.1 Proposed Action....48
4.12.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative....49
4.12.3 No-Action Alternative....50
4.13 Geology and Soils....50
4.13.1 Proposed Action....50
4.13.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative....50
4.13.3 No-Action Alternative....50
4.14 Environmental Justice....50
4.15 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts....51
4.16 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts....51
4.17 Relationship between Short-Term Uses and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity....51
4.18 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources....51

SECTION 5.0 PERSONS CONTACTED....53

SECTION 6.0 LIST OF PREPARERS....56

SECTION 7.0 REFERENCES....58

FIGURES

Figure 1-1 Project Location and Vicinity Map, Demolish/Re-Construct Pelican Pier and Seawall, MacDill Air Force Base

Figure 2-1 Civil Engineering Pelican Pier Site Plan, Demolish/Re-Construct Pelican Pier and Seawall, MacDill Air Force Base

Figure 2-2 Demolish/Re-Construct Pelican Pier and Seawall, MacDill Air Force Base

Figure 3-1 Environmental Constraints in Vicinity of Pelican Pier, Demolish/Re-Construct Pelican Pier and Seawall, MacDill Air Force Base

Figure 3-2 100-Year Floodplain Map, Demolish/Re-Construct Pelican Pier and Seawall, MacDill Air Force Base

TABLES

Table 2.9.1 Comparision of Environmental Consequences, Demolish/Re-Construct Pelican Pier and Seawall, MacDill Air Force Base

Table 3.1.2 Stationary Air Emissions Inventory, Hillsborough County, Florida

Table 3.1.3 National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards

Table 3.6.4 Summary of Protected Species Identified at MacDill Air Force Base

Table 4.1.1 Proposed Action Air Emissions at MacDill AFB

APPENDIX A CONSISTENCY STATEMENT A-1

APPENDIX B AF FORM 813 B-1

APPENDIX C AIR EMISSION CALCULATIONS FOR PROPOSED ACTION AND CUMMULATIVE AIR EMISSONS C-1

APPENDIX D PUBLIC NOTICE AND AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE D-1

SECTION 1.0
PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION

This Environmental Assessment (EA) examines the potential for impacts to the environment resulting from the demolition of the existing pier, and construction of a new pier and seawall on MacDill Air Force Base (AFB). The pier and seawall (MacDill Faciltiy No. 352), known today as Pelican Pier, was originally constructed in 1942 to serve as a docking point for crash rescue boats used to recover pilots and aircraft that crashed in the bay during training. Over time, use of the pier shifted to primarily recreational use such as fishing; however, the pier and seawall have become severely worn with age and exposure. Damage to the pier includes "washouts" behind the seawall, uneven and weathered planks, and corroded pilings. Wing Safety has determined the pier to be structurally unsafe and has placed Pelican Pier off-limits. Construction of the new multi million dollar Mission Planning Center across the street from Pelican Pier has focused attention on the delopidated structure and inspired renovation of the pier.

1.1 MISSION

Since 1996, MacDill AFB has been host to the 43rd Aerial Refueling Group (ARG) which joined the 6th Air Base Wing to form the 6th Air Refueling Wing (6 ARW). In January 2001, the 310 Airlift Squadron bedded down at MacDill AFB and subsequently assumed the Unified Combatant Commander support mission. Consequently the wing was redesignated as a mobility wing as a result of having both an air refueling and an airlift squadron in the unit. The 6 AMW is the host unit at MacDill AFB and reports to the Air Mobility Command (AMC), headquartered at Scott AFB, Illinois. The mission of the wing is to provide worldwide air refueling and airlift in support of the Air Force's Global Reach, Global Power mission, and administrative, medical, and logistical support for United States Central Command (USCENTCOM) and the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). In addition, the Base provides similar support to tenant

agencies and the MacDill community, including over 70,000 retirees and their families. The organizational structure of 6 AMW consists primarily of a maintenance group, medical group, operations group, and mission support group.

1.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION

The existing Pelican Pier at MacDill AFB was originally constructed in 1942 and is in severe disrepair. Damage to the pier includes "washouts" behind the seawall, uneven and weathered planks, and corroded pilings. Wing Safety has determined Pelican Pier to be structurally unsafe and has placed the pier off-limits. Renovation of the pier would return this functional and visually appealing structure to a useful condition, thereby increasing recreational opportunities on the base, as well as base morale.

1.3 LOCATION OF PROPOSED ACTION

The Proposed Action would take place at MacDill AFB, located in Tampa, Florida. The Base occupies approximately 5,630 acres and is in Hillsborough County adjacent to the City of Tampa, at the southern tip of the Interbay Peninsula (Figure 1-1). The Base is surrounded on three sides by Tampa Bay and Hillsborough Bay, and is bordered on the north by development within the City of Tampa. The site proposed for construction of the Proposed Action is located on the northeast portion of the base, near the Base Housing District (Figure 1-1). The Pelican Pier Replacement would be located at the site of the existing pier.

In November 2001, MacDill AFB broke ground on a $10M MILCON project to construct a Mission Planning Center. This facility will host numerous meetings, conferences and seminars for all levels of military leadership from the Base to the Department of Defense. The pier, located directly across the street from this world class facility, is in a state of disrepair from neglect. The Replace Pelican Pier project aims to create a world class park, construct a pavilion for gatherings and replace the existing pier with a modern, safe structure. The primary purpose of this project is to make this area the center piece of MacDill AFB and to complement and support the Mission Planning Center.

1.4 THE SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This EA identifies, describes, and evaluates potential environmental impacts associated with the alternatives identified for implementation of the Proposed Action. The EA includes an analysis of the impacts of the alternatives on the following environmental resources: air quality, noise, cultural resources, hazardous materials/waste, water resources, biological resources, land use, socioeconomics, safety and occupational health, geology and soils.

1.5 APPLICABLE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

This environmental analysis has been conducted in accordance with the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §§1500-1508, as they implement the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 U.S.C. §4321, et seq., and the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process, as promulgated in 32 CFR Part 989. These regulations require federal agencies to analyze the potential environmental impacts of proposed actions and alternatives and to use these analyses in making decisions on a proposed action. Cumulative effects of other on-going activities must also be assessed in combination with the Proposed Action. The CEQ was instituted to oversee federal policy in this process. The CEQ regulations declare that an EA is required to accomplish the following objectives:

- Briefly provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI);
- Aid in an agency's compliance with NEPA when an EIS is not necessary, and facilitate preparation of an EIS when necessary.

The procedural requirements for the implementation of NEPA and preparation of the EA are specified in 32 CFR 989.

Other environmental regulatory requirements relevant to the Proposed Action and alternatives also are identified in this EA. Regulatory requirements under the following programs among others will be assessed: Noise Control Act; Clean Air Act; Clean Water Act; National Historic Preservation Act; Endangered Species Act; Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA); and Occupational Safety and Health Act. Requirements also include

compliance with Executive Order (EO) 11988, Floodplain Management; EO 11990, Protection of Wetlands; Federal Coastal Zone Management Act; and EO 12898, Environmental Justice.

1.6 COASTAL ZONE CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

The Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) creates a state-federal partnership to ensure the protection of coastal resources. The Federal CZMA requires each Federal agency activity within or outside the coastal zone, that affects any land or water use or natural resources of the coastal zone, to be carried out in a manner consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Florida Coastal Management Program (CMP). The Florida CZMA presumes that "direct Federal activities" will directly affect the coastal zone. According to the Florida CMP, "direct Federal activities" are those that "are conducted or supported by or on behalf of a Federal agency in the exercise of its statutory responsibilities, including development projects."

The Federal CZMA required Federal agencies carrying out activities subject to the Act to provide a "consistency determination" to the relevant state agency. The Federal regulations implementing the Act then require the state agency to inform the Federal agency of its agreement or disagreement with the Federal agency's consistency determination. Therefore, the Proposed Action and alternatives for implementing the Proposed Action require a consistency determination to be submitted by the U.S. Air Force to the relevant Florida agency and a response from the State of Florida of either agreement or disagreement with that determination. The Air Force's Consistency Determination is contained in the Consistency Statement at Appendix A. The State of Florida agrees with the Air Force's Consistency Determination for the Proposed Action (Appendix D). Of the Florida statutory authorities included in the CMP, impacts from the Proposed Action, and mitigation of such impacts in the following areas are addressed in this EA: beach and shore preservation (Chapter 161), historic preservation (Chapter 267), economic development and tourism (Chapter 288), public transportation (Chapters 334 and 339), saltwater living resources (Chapter 370), living land and freshwater resources (Chapter 372), water resources (Chapter 373), environmental control (Chapter 403), and soil and water conservation (Chapter 582).

SECTION 2.0
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

This section provides a description of the Proposed Action and alternatives to the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is to demolish the existing Pelican Pier and to construct a new, redesigned pier and seawall system. The layout of the new pier and seawall would be constructed in the same area as the existing piers. The area would still consist of two piers, which would be approximately the same length and width as the existing piers that would be removed. The 400-foot length of seawall that is oriented roughly north-south would be removed entirely and replaced with rip-rap or other loose, heavy aggregate. The shorter length of seawall oriented east-west would be replaced in-kind. A floating dock would be attached to the southern pier. A restroom/storage facility is proposed which would be connected to existing power, water, and sewer services.

The Proposed Action includes demolition of the existing pier and seawall, as well as the completion of construction of the new facility. Demolition of Building 352 (Pelican Pier) is required to provide space for the construction of the new facility, and to remove a derilict structure from the base.

One alternative to the Proposed Action considered in this EA was to replace the existing Pelican Pier without modification, in lieu of modifying the pier. This alternative is identified as the Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative. This alternative would involve the demolition of the existing seawall and piers and replacement with identical structures, including approximately 650 feet of seawall, 650 feet of dock parallel to the seawall, and two piers of approximately 200 feet each in length. The existing seawall that would be replaced in-kind consists of two areas; one length of approximately 450 feet and generally oriented north/south, and a perpendicular length at the south end approximately 200 feet long. A new seawall would be constructed behind the existing seawall before the existing seawall is removed. The existing pilings would be removed and replaced with new pilings. The existing decking and support structures would be removed and replaced.

Another alternative considered was the No-Action Alternative, which would not construct, expand, or demolish any facilities.

This section specifically includes the following:

- A list of the environmental constraints and other selection criteria that influence selection of potential locations for implementing the Proposed Action;
- A detailed description of the Proposed Action;
- A description of the alternative considered for implementation of the Proposed Action; and
- A matrix comparing the environmental effects of the Proposed Action and an alternative.

2.1 SELECTION CRITERIA

The new Pelican Pier facility is required to be located in an area that is highly visible and directly across the street from the Mission Planning Center. Replacement of the pier must fit into the long-range development plans for the base. The Proposed Action and the Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative both meet the selection criteria.

2.2 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Proposed Action is the construction of a new Pelican Pier and repair of the existing shoreline to provide adequate gathering facility for the base populace and conference attendees. In addition, the renovated pier would provide limited recreational opportunities for base personnel.

The proposed facility would be constructed in the northeastern portion of the base, near the Residential District, approximately 600 feet north of the Staff Circle Historic District. The proposed pier would be constructed in the location of the existing pier. The area immediately surrounding the pier is a mix of grassy areas and paved parking lots. Additional parking spaces, as well as a small restroom facility, would be constructed proximate to the seawall. The existing parking would be removed and accessways to the pier would have minor modifications (Figure 2-1).

The proposed pier would be constructed of pressure-treated lumber, founded on pressure-treated wood pilings, and have two perpendicular piers measuring approximately 16 feet by 200 feet. The southern pier would include approximately 60 lineal feet of floating dock attached to the end of the pier, and the northern pier would include a small pavillion at the end of the pier. The total pier area is estimated at approximately 6,400 square feet.

The principle reason for renovation of Pelican Pier is to restore this base landmark, provide for a sense of community and create an aesthetic, park-like setting to augment the newly-constructed Mission Planning Center, located to the west of the site. To this end, the existing parking lot and asphalt surfaces located immediately west and south of the pier area, would be removed and replaced with grass, trees, native landscaping, and benches.

The relatively large parking lot located southwest of the pier area would remain but would be resufaced and augmented with medians for planting. A small building would be constructed between the pier and the parking lot. The building, an open-air pavilion, a small storage area and a restroom facility, would serve as a gathering place for base personnel and visitors alike. The Proposed Action also includes demolition of the existing pier, Facility 352 (Figure 2-2). The demolition of this facility would be accomplished by physically removing the planking and railing. Existing pilings would be removed using equipment based on barges. The material from the existing pier would be temporarily stockpiled, loaded into large roll-off containers for disposal off-base at a construction and demolition debris landfill.

All connections to the electrical system would be disconnected, and new connections for the electrical, phone, and sanitary sewer system would subsequently be created to the new pier and bathroom facility.

2.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE REPLACE PELICAN PIER IN-KIND ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative, the existing Pelican Pier facility would be demolished and replaced as described in the Detailed Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives (Section 2.0). The existing Pelican Pier was constructed in 1942, and has no historical context.

Currently, Pelican Pier is in a deteriorated condition, and Wing Safety has determined the pier to be structurally unsafe and is currently off-limits. This alternative would involve the demolition of the existing seawall and piers and replacement with identical structures, including approximately 650 feet of seawall, 650 feet of dock parallel to the seawall, and two piers of approximately 200 feet each in length. The existing seawall that would be replacement in-kind, consists of two areas; one length of approximately 450 feet and generally oriented north/south, and a perpendicular length at

the south end approximately 200 feet long. A new seawall would be constructed behind the existing seawall before the existing seawall is removed. The existing pilings would be removed and replaced with new pilings. The existing decking and support structures would be removed and replaced.

2.4 DESCRIPTION OF THE NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No-Action Alternative, the construction of a new Pelican Pier, or the Replacement of Pelican Pier In-Kind would not be completed. Under this alternative, the existing pier and surrounding area would continue to deteriorate, creating a safety hazard and an eysore personnel visiting and working in the Mission Planning Center, as well as base personnel. This decaying structure would be visible to everyone visiting the base and attending conference at the Mission Planning Center. In addition, the structure is located within easy walking distance from the MacDill Family Housing area, creating a safety hazard for curious children and adults.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER STUDY

No alternatives were considered but eliminated from further study as part of this EA.

2.6 IDENTIFICATION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Construction of a new Pelican Pier facility at the selected location, as proposed in Section 2.2 is the agency-preferred alternative.

2.7 IDENTIFICATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The environmentally preferred alternative is the Proposed Action. This alternative includes the installation of a new seawall to be constructed behind (landward) of the existing seawall. The existing seawall would then be removed. This alternative minimizes the time littoral areas are potentially disturbed, as the construction of the new seawall would be landward of the existing seawall, and the existing seawall would act as a buffer during construction. Under the Proposed Action the length of seawall would be reduced by almost 500 lineal feet and replaced with a natural (but stablized) shoreline. This would result in a net improvement from an ecological standpoint.

2.8 OTHER ACTIVITIES IN THE AREA

The Mission Planning Center Project is located approximately 600 feet to the southwest of the Pier, and is currently under construction. The Mission Planning Center is a proposed 31,054-square foot masonry structure with 31,000 square feet of associated parking. The building will be finished at an elevation of 11 feet above mean sea level (MSL) in order to meet the construction restraints of lying within a flood-prone area. The proposed building will contain multi-conference rooms, audio/visual equipment rooms, administrative areas, storage, and a kitchen. The total area of construction is approximately 6.1 acres, which includes a storm water retention area. No other construction or demolition projects are proposed for the area around Pelican Pier.

2.9 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

Table 2.9.1 show the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives.

Table 2.9.1 Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Environmental Resources	Alternative A – Proposed Action	Alternative B - Replace In-Kind	Alternative C – No Action
Air Quality	Short-term – *Minor Adverse* Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – *Minor Adverse* Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact
Noise	Short-term – Minor Adverse Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – Minor Adverse Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact
Hazardous Materials/Wastes/ Stored Fuels	Short-term – Minor Adverse Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – Minor Adverse Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact
Water Resources	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – Minor Adverse	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact
Floodplains	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact
Biological	Short-term – *Minor*	Short-term – *Minor*	Short-term – No

Environmental Resources	Alternative A – Proposed Action	Alternative B - Replace In-Kind	Alternative C – No Action
Resources	*Adverse* Long-term – No Impact	*Adverse* Long-term – No Impact	Impact Long-term – No Impact
Geology and Soils	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact
Socioeconomics Cultural Resources	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact
Transportation	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact
Safety and Occupational Health	Short-term – *Minor Adverse* Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – *Minor Adverse* Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – *Minor Adverse*
Environmental Justice	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact
Indirect and Cumulative Impacts	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact	Short-term – No Impact Long-term – No Impact

SECTION 3.0
AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This section describes the characteristics of the existing natural and man-made environment that could be affected by implementation of the Proposed Action including all considered alternatives. A summary of the overall mission objectives of MacDill AFB is also provided. This section establishes the basis for assessing impacts of the alternatives on the affected environment provided in Section 4.0.

First established in 1939 as an Army airfield, MacDill AFB became an Air Force Base in 1948. The Base has undergone several mission changes and played a vital role in training and strategic defense. Today, the host unit at MacDill AFB is the 6th AMW. The Base is home to several key tenant units, including USCENTCOM, USSOCOM, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) of the Department of Commerce (DOC).

MacDill AFB comprises 5,630 acres. The installation elevation ranges from sea level to approximately 15 feet above MSL. Much of the AFB is less than 5 feet above MSL, and wetland areas are common, especially mangrove wetlands.

The Base has one active runway (04-22) and an inactive runway that is used as a taxiway. MacDill AFB airfield facilities provide the capability to accommodate any aircraft in service with the United States government. The Base contains more than 900 buildings, including administrative and support facilities, a hospital and dental clinic, military housing, and recreation areas.

MacDill AFB is located in Hillsborough County at the southern tip of the Interbay Peninsula. The Base is surrounded on three sides by Tampa Bay and Hillsborough Bay and is bordered on the north by development within the City of Tampa. Land uses adjacent to the Base are a mix of single-family residential, light commercial and industrial designations.

The area has a humid, subtropical climate characterized by long, hot summers and short, mild winters. The average annual temperature is approximately 73 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) with average

minimum and maximum temperatures being approximately 63°F and 82°F, respectively. The rainy season generally occurs from May through September, with the dry season occurring during late fall and winter. Annual rainfall averages approximately 44 inches.

3.1 AIR QUALITY

The Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended in 1977 and 1990, provides the basis for regulating air pollution to the atmosphere. Different provisions of the CAA apply depending on where the source is located, which pollutants are being emitted, and in what amounts. The CAA required the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to establish ambient ceilings for certain criteria pollutants. The ceilings were based on the latest scientific information regarding the effects a pollutant may have on public health or welfare. Subsequently, USEPA promulgated regulations that set national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). Two classes of standards were established, primary and secondary. Primary standards define levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect public health, including the health of "sensitive" populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly. Secondary standards define levels of air quality necessary to protect public welfare (e.g., decreased visibility; damage to animals, crops, vegetation, wildlife, and buildings) from any known to anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.

Air quality standards are currently in place for six "criteria" pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), ozone (O_3), sulfur oxides (SO_x, measured as sulfur dioxide [SO_2]), lead (Pb), and particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 micrometers (PM_{10}). There are many suspended particles in the atmosphere with aerodynamic diameters larger than PM_{10}, and the collective of all particle sizes is commonly referred to as total suspended particulates (TSP). The NAAQS are the cornerstone of the CAA. Although not directly enforceable, they are the benchmark for the establishment of emission limitations by the states for the pollutants USEPA determines may endanger public health or welfare.

O_3 (ground-level), which is a major component of "smog", is a secondary pollutant formed in the atmosphere by photochemical reactions involving previously emitted pollutants or precursors. Ozone precursors are mainly nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Nitrogen oxides are the designation given to the group of all oxygenated nitrogen species, including nitric oxide (NO), NO_2, nitrous oxide (N_2O), and others. However, only NO, NO_2, and N_2O are

found in appreciable quantities in the atmosphere. Volatile organic compounds (containing at least carbon and hydrogen), that participate in photochemical reactions, and include carbonaceous compounds except metallic carbonates, metallic carbides, ammonium carbonate, carbon dioxide (CO_2), and carbonic acid. Some VOCs are considered to be nonreactive under atmospheric conditions, and include methane, ethane, and other organic compounds.

As noted above, O_3 is a secondary pollutant and is not directly emitted from common emissions sources. Therefore, to control O_3 in the atmosphere, the effort is made to control NO_x and VOC emissions. For this reason, NO_x and VOC emissions are calculated and reported in emission inventories.

The Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County (EPC) is responsible for issuing and enforcing the CAA Title V Air Operation Permit (Permit No. 0570141-001-AV issued 21 Oct 99) for MacDill AFB. The regulated emission units at MacDill AFB include seven JP-8 fuel tanks, one additive storage tank, three steam generating boilers, two liquid oxygen/nitrogen generators, nine paint spray booths, and a bead-blasting booth. The 1998 air emission inventory at MacDill AFB found the installation is a major source of nitrogen oxides with potential emissions of 184 tons per year. The Title V Air Operation Permit indicates the installation is not a major source of hazardous air pollutants. MacDill AFB files compliance emission test data with the county, and periodically or continuously monitors emission sources as necessary under the Title V permit.

3.1.1 Attainment Status

The fundamental method by which USEPA tracks compliance with the NAAQS is the designation of a particular geographic region as “attainment” or “non-attainment.” Based on the NAAQS, each state is divided into four types of areas for each of the criteria pollutants:

1) Those areas that are in compliance with the NAAQS (attainment),
2) Those areas that don’t meet the ambient air quality standards (non-attainment),
3) Those areas that were formerly non-attainment, but are currently in maintenance of attainment status, and
4) Those areas where a determination of attainment/non-attainment cannot be made due to a lack of monitoring data (unclassifiable – treated as attainment until proven otherwise).

MacDill AFB is located in Hillsborough County within the West Central Florida Intrastate Air Quality Control Region (AQCR). Hillsborough County has received full air permitting delegation from the State of Florida. This allows the EPC, exclusively, to conduct permitting determinations, process applications, and issue air pollution permits for most facilities. While Hillsborough County has one monitoring location not in attainment for lead, the USEPA has designated the air quality within Hillsborough County as meeting NAAQS for all criteria pollutants (60 FR 62748, December 7, 1995). The county was formerly non-attainment for ozone, but is currently in maintenance of attainment.

3.1.2 Baseline Air Emissions

An air emissions inventory is an estimate of total mass emission of pollutants generated from a source or sources over a period of time, typically a year. The quantity of air pollutants is generally measured in pounds per year or tons per year (tpy). Emission sources may be categorized as either mobile or stationary emission sources. Typically, mobile emission sources at Air Force installations include aircraft, surface vehicles, aerospace ground equipment, and weapons testing. Stationary emission sources may include boilers, generators, fueling operations, industrial processes, and burning activities among others. Accurate air emissions inventories are needed for estimating the relationship between emissions sources and air quality. The Air Emissions Inventory summary for Hillsborough County is presented in Table 3.1.2 and includes only stationary sources.

Table 3.1.2 Stationary Air Emissions Inventory, Hillsborough County, Florida

Stationary Pollutant Emission Sources	CO (tpy)	VOC (tpy)	So_x (tpy)	No_x (tpy)	PM_{10} (tpy)[3]	Pb (tpy)
Hillsborough County[1]	19,272	27,703	NA	82,563	NA	53
MacDill AFB[2]	5.06	31.73	0.56	15.48	5.41	--

1Source: 1997 Air Emissions Inventory, EPC of Hillsborough County

NA = not available

Source: MacDill AFB 1998 Air Emissions Inventory, Executive Summary

PM10 estimated as 50 percent of the 1990 tons per year reported for TSP.

Radon gas. The level at which the USEPA recommends consideration of radon mitigation measures is 4 picocuries per liter (pCi/L). According to a sampling report obtained from 6

AMDS/SGPB, radon at these levels is not a concern at MacDill AFB (USAF, 1987). All samples analyzed were below the USEPA target levels of 4 pCi/L.

3.1.3 State Regulations

The CAA does not make the NAAQS directly enforceable, but requires each state to promulgate a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that provides for implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of the NAAQS in each AQCR in the state. The CAA also allows states to adopt air quality standards that are more stringent than the federal standards. The Florida SIP has adopted the NAAQS as the Florida standards as listed in Table 3.1.3.

Table 3.1.3 National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards

Criteria Pollutant	Averaging Time	Primary NAAQS[a,b,c]	Secondary NAAQS[a,b,d]	Florida Standards[a,b]
Carbon Monoxide	8-hour 1-hour	9 ppm (10 mg/m^3) 35 ppm (40 mg/m^3)	No standard No standard	9 ppm (10 mg/m^3) 35 ppm (40 mg/m^3)
Lead	Quarterly	1.5 μg/m^3	1.5 μg/m^3	1.5 μg/m^3
Nitrogen Dioxide	Annual	0.0543 ppm (100 μg/m^3)	0.0543 ppm (100 μg/m^3)	0.0543 ppm (100 μ g/m^3)
Ozone	8-hour	0.08 ppm (150 μg/m^3)	0.08ppm (150 μg/m^3)	0.08ppm (150 μg/m^3)
PM_{10}	Annual 24-hour	50μg/m^3 150 μg/m^3	50μg/m^3 150 μg/m^3	50μg/m^3 150 μg/m^3
Sulfur Oxides (measured as SO_2)	Annual 24-hour 3-hour	0.03 ppm (80 μg/m^3) 0.14 ppm (365 μg/m^3) No standard	No standard No standard 0.50 ppm (1,300 μg/m^3)	0.03 ppm (80 μg/m^3) 0.14 ppm (365 μg/m^3) No standard

PM_{10} Particles with aerodynamic diameters less than or equal to a nominal 10 micrometers

a The 8-hour primary and secondary ambient air quality standards are met at a monitoring site when the average of the annual fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour average ozone concentration is less than or equal to 0.08 ppm.

b The NAAQS and Florida standards are based on standard temperature and pressure of 25 degrees Celsius and 760 millimeters of mercury.

c National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public health with an adequate margin of safety. Each state must attain the primary standards no later than three years after the state implementation plan is approved by the USEPA

d National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant. Each state must attain the secondary standards within a "reasonable time" after the state implementation plan is approved.

3.2 NOISE

The meaning of noise for this analysis is undesirable sound that interferes with speech communication and hearing, or is otherwise annoying (unwanted sound). Under certain conditions, noise may cause hearing loss, interfere with human activities at home and work, and may affect people's health and well-being in various ways. Community noise levels usually change continuously during the day, and also exhibit a daily, weekly, and yearly pattern.

The day-night average sound level (DNL) developed to evaluate the total daily community noise environment applies here. In June 1980, the Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise published guidelines relating DNL values to compatible land uses. This committee was composed of representatives from the U.S. Departments of Defense, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development; the USEPA; and the Veterans Administration. Since their issuance, Federal agencies have generally adopted their guidelines for noise analysis. Most agencies have identified 65 dB DNL as a criterion that protects those most affected by noise and that can often be achieved on a practical basis.

Base activities that have the highest potential source of noise impacts are the aircraft/airspace operations. The Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study (1996) plotted the DNL from 65 to 80 dB for a typical busy day at MacDill. The DNL contours reflect the aircraft operations at MacDill AFB. The larger DNL 65 dB contour covers the main runway, and extends about one mile southwest over Tampa Bay, and about 1 ½ miles northeast over Hillsborough Bay. A second, smaller DNL 65 dB is centered near the southeastern end of the inactive runway (taxiway), northeast of the existing pier. Pelican Pier is outside both of these 65 dB contour intervals (see Figure 3-1).

3.3 WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, AND STORED FUEL

3.3.1 Wastes

There are two classifications of wastes generated at MacDill AFB: nonhazardous solid waste and hazardous waste. Nearly 80 percent of the solid waste generated from various residential and industrial sources at MacDill AFB is incinerated as an energy source at the City of Tampa incineration facility located off base. The remaining wastes are disposed at Hillsborough County

landfill facilities. Curbside recycling is available in Military Family Housing areas at the Base; and cardboard, paper, and aluminum recycling is conducted throughout the Base.

Hazardous wastes generated at MacDill AFB include solvents, fuels, lubricants, stripping materials, used oils, waste paint-related materials, and other miscellaneous wastes. The responsibility for managing hazardous waste lies with the generating organization and 6 CES/CEV. Wastes come from approximately 50 locations throughout the Base and are managed at satellite accumulation points base-wide. A satellite accumulation point can accumulated up to 55 gallons of waste for an indefinite length of time. Satellite accumulation points are located at or near the points of hazardous waste generation. The former hazardous waste storage facility at Building 1115 is now in closure status under RCRA and is currently classified as a 90-day accumulation point. At a 90-day accumulation point an indefinite quantity of hazardous waste can be accumulated for up to 90 days. The Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO) is responsible for the sale, reclamation, or disposal of hazardous materials and wastes.

Used oil is accumulated at sites around the Base and is periodically picked up by an outside contractor for recycling. Waste antifreeze, tires, batteries, and fluorescent light bulbs are also picked up by outside contractors for recycling.

3.3.2 Hazardous Materials

Approximately 105 operations base-wide use hazardous materials. Hazardous materials on-base include various organic solvents, chlorine, freon, paints, thinners, oils, lubricants, compressed gases, pesticides, herbicides, nitrates, and chromates. A detailed tracking and accounting system is in place to identify potentially hazardous materials and to ensure that Base organizations are approved to use specific hazardous materials. The Base is following Air Force guidelines to identify and eliminate the use of ozone-depleting chemicals.

3.3.3 Stored Fuel

The Base receives jet fuel (JP-8) at the Defense Fuel Supply Point (DFSP) by pipeline from Port Tampa, while other fuels are delivered to the Base by commercial tank trucks. JP-8 storage capacity at DFSP and MacDill AFB is over 7.5 million gallons. The storage facilities consist of four large, aboveground, floating-roof tanks at DFSP (total capacity 5.3 million gallons total); 44 underground

hydrant tanks for the flightline (total capacity 2.2 million gallons); three aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) at the Fuels Mobility Support Equipment (FMSE) area; and small ASTs and underground storage tanks (USTs) at various locations throughout the Base.

3.4 WATER RESOURCES

3.4.1 Surface Water

Surface water flows at the Base are primarily from storm water runoff. Topographic maps show that the entire Base is an independent drainage area with no natural surface waters entering or leaving the site prior to final discharge into Tampa Bay. Most of the Base drains toward the southern tip of the Interbay Peninsula; however, the easternmost section of the Base drains toward Hillsborough Bay.

About 25 percent of the Base surface cover is impervious. The remaining soil type is predominantly poorly drained fine sands. The drainage system consists of piping and surface ditches. The man-made ponds that exist are primarily on the southeast portion of the Base. In the southern portion of the Base there is a poorly drained area that includes two creeks, Coon's Hammock Creek and Broad Creek. This area is subject to shallow flooding by the highest of normal tides.

The USEPA issued a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) multi-sector storm water general permit (No. FLR05B679) to MacDill AFB in November 1998. This permit authorizes the discharge of storm water associated with industrial activity. Areas of potential runoff contamination at the Base are the runways and the airfield aprons.

In addition to runoff flows, there are non-rainfall related flows discharging into the storm water system. These flows include drainage from equipment maintenance facilities. To control for discharges of floating pollutants resulting from accidental spills, the Base maintains a number of boom-type containment systems and absorbents across storm water channels. Most of these facilities discharge into the sanitary sewer system. The Base also maintains a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan to satisfy 40 CFR 112. Per the same regulation, a Facility Response Plan was developed given the location of the Base adjacent to navigable waters and shorelines, as well as the amount of fuel storage capacity existing on site.

3.4.2 Groundwater

There are two aquifer systems underlying MacDill AFB, the surficial aquifer and the Floridan Aquifer. The surficial aquifer system, which consists generally of sand, clayey sand, and shell, is unconfined and is approximately 20 feet thick; however, the surficial aquifer is not used for water supply at MacDill AFB. In residential areas beyond the Base boundaries, small-diameter wells are often installed in the surficial aquifer to supply small irrigation systems. The Floridan Aquifer underlies the surficial aquifer and is separated from it by a clay confining layer. The Floridan Aquifer is a major source of groundwater in the region, but is not used for water supply at MacDill AFB. Potable water is supplied to MacDill AFB by the City of Tampa, which obtains most of its drinking water from surface water sources.

The water table in the surficial aquifer is shallow and ranges from land surface near Tampa Bay and tidal creeks to approximately five feet below land surface at inland locations. Groundwater levels and flow directions generally are determined by low gradients and are tidally influenced by ditches and canals, and by Hillsborough and Tampa Bays. The direction of groundwater flow in the surficial aquifer is generally radial from the north-central portion of the Base towards the coastline. Groundwater mounding has been shown to occur in the golf course area where reclaimed water from the on-base wastewater treatment plant is applied by spray irrigation.

Groundwater quality has been affected by past and present Base activities. Elevated volatile organic compound concentrations have been found in surficial aquifer groundwater at various sites that contain or contained petroleum storage tanks. Elevated metals concentrations have been found in areas of former landfills. Elevated nitrate, nitrite, and pesticide concentrations have been identified in golf course areas.

3.5 FLOODPLAINS

According to information provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA Maps dated 1982-1991), approximately 80 percent of the Base is within the 100-year floodplain (see Figure 3-2). The maps indicate that all the residential, industrial, and institutional (medical and education) land uses on the Base are within the 100-year floodplain, along with most of the

commercial and aviation support areas. The remaining 20 percent of land that is above the floodplain is designated primarily for airfield operations.

The extent of the floodplain is an important consideration for MacDill AFB because EO 11988, Floodplain Management Guidelines, regulates the uses of these areas. The objective of this presidential order is to avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with occupancy and modification of floodplains. The order applies to all Federal agencies conducting activities and programs that may potentially affect floodplains. To comply with EO 11988, before taking any action, the Air Force must evaluate the impacts of specific proposals in the floodplain. The site of the Proposed Action and alternatives are located within the 100-year floodplain.

3.6 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.6.1 Vegetative Communities

Land use on MacDill AFB includes urban, light industrial, residential, or improved vacant land. The improved vacant land includes cleared open fields, grassed areas, treated wastewater spray fields, and a golf course. The developed and semi-developed areas on the Base comprise approximately 3,500 acres of the 5,630-acre Base. The few undeveloped areas within the Base boundaries have all experienced some degree of disturbance, such as ditching, clearing, or the encroachment of exotic vegetation. The unimproved vegetative communities include forested uplands and shrub-scrub wetlands.

3.6.2 Wetlands

The 1998 Wetland Delineation Study identified, delineated, and classified approximately 1,195 acres of wetlands on MacDill AFB. Wetland systems included palustrine wetlands (317 acres) and scrub/shrub wetlands (880 acres). Mangrove wetlands are the principal scrub/shrub wetland community on the Base. Black mangrove (*Avicennia germinans*) and white mangrove (*Laguncularia racemosa*) are the dominant species. Red mangrove (*Rhizophora mangle*) is also present at the waterward fringes of the community. The mangroves have been negatively impacted by historic dredge and fill activities and the excavation of mosquito ditches. However, despite these

impacts, this community provides valuable wildlife habitat and is protected by state and local regulations.

A jurisdictional wetland survey performed by an U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE) certified wetland delineator indicated the locations of Waters of the United States and vegetated wetlands at MacDill AFB (USAF, 1998). Wetland areas, identified as mangrove swamp, are located in both directions along the shoreline immediately beyond the limits of the Pier and associated seawall (Figure 3-1).

3.6.3 Wildlife

Representatives from the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (formerly the Florida Game and Freshwater Fish Commission), National Audubon Society, and the Tampa Bay Sanctuaries completed an evaluation of the wildlife habitat on MacDill AFB in 1994. These surveys determined that the habitat quality ranged from poor to excellent, with the upland forested communities considered poor and the mangrove wetlands considered excellent. The upland forested habitat has been degraded for native fauna due to the suppression of the natural fire cycle, the fragmentation of the habitat, and the invasion of exotic vegetation. The mangrove wetland habitat has been degraded somewhat by the excavation of mosquito ditches and the deposition of spoil within the wetlands. However, the large contiguous habitat area that the mangroves provide and the relative inaccessibility to humans have increased the habitat value.

The surveys also included an evaluation of the wildlife species present and potentially present on the Base. The species observed during the surveys included one reptile, 10 mammals, and 79 birds. Based on the types of habitat available, the survey concluded that 20 reptiles, 17 mammals, and 155 birds might occur within the boundaries of the Base.

MacDill AFB has developed an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) which details how the base manages, protects and improves it's natural resource and outdoor areas. The INRMP utilizes an ecosystem management approach and aims to protect and improve entire ecologic communities which will in turn benefit individual species with the community. The INRMP outlines numerous projects designed to restore habitat areas, protect and encourage threatened and endangered species, improve outdoor recreation, and generally promote the protection, improvement and use of the base's natural areas.

3.6.4 Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Species

Wildlife species listed by federal or state agencies as endangered, threatened, or of special concern and known to occur permanently or periodically, or have the potential to occur on the Base are shown in Table 3.6.4. The majority of the listed species are associated with the mangrove community and include shore birds, wading birds, and raptors. These species use the mangrove community primarily for foraging and nesting.

The forested upland communities provide habitat for several state and federally listed species. The southeastern American kestrel, the burrowing owl, and gopher tortoise have been observed within this community on the Base. Other listed species that may occur in this habitat include the gopher frog *(Rana capito)*, Florida pine snake *(Pituophis melanoleucus mugitus)*, short-tailed snake *(Stilosoma extenuatum)*, Bachman's warbler (*Vermivora bachmanii)*, and the Florida mouse (*Podomys floridanus)*. Two bald eagle *(Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) nests have been observed south of the proposed site. Base personnel indicate the easternmost nest has been abandoned, and the eagle pair has moved to the westernmost nest. The western boundary of the housing area is located just outside the 750-foot clear zone for the abandoned nest. The existing Pelican Pier lies approximately 4,500 feet outside of the 1,500-foot clear zone of the newer, westernmost nest, and 3,000 feet northeast of the abandoned nest.

In 1996, the *Endangered Species Management Plan MacDill AFB* and the *Biological Survey of MacDill AFB* identified the general locations of protected species at MacDill AFB. Neither survey identified other nesting sites or other species habitat for protected species at or in the vicinity of the proposed Pelican Pier. Notwithstanding, the area of the proposed pier is subject to intermittent visits from the West Indian Manatee (*Trichechus manatus)*.

Table 3.6.4 Summary of Protected Species Identified at MacDill AFB

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	
		Federal	State
Reptile/Amphibians			
American alligator	*Alligator mississippiensis*	T (SA)	SSC
Atlantic loggerhead turtle	*Caretta caretta caretta*	T	T
Atlantic green turtle	*Chelonia mydas mydas*	E	E
Gopher tortoise	*Gopherus polyphemus*	-	SSC

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	
		Federal	State
Gopher frog	*Rana capito*	C2	SSC
Florida pine snake	*Pituophis melanoleucus mugitus*	C2	SSC
Short-tailed snake	*Stilosoma extenuatum*	C2	T
Birds			
Roseate spoonbill	*Ajaia ajaja*	-	SSC
Limpkin	*Aramus guarauna*	-	SSC
Burrowing owl	*Athene cunicularia*	-	SSC
Piping plover	*Charadrius melodus*	T	T
Southeastern snowy plover	*Charadrius alexandrinus tenuirostris*	C2	T
Little blue heron	*Egretta caerulea*	C2	SSC
Reddish egret	*Egretta rufescens*	C2	SSC
Snowy egret	*Egretts thula*	-	SSC
Tricolored heron	*Egretta tricolor*	-	SSC
Peregrine falcon	*Falco peregrinus tundris*	T	E
Southeast American kestrel	*Falco sparverius paulus*	C2	E
Florida sandhill crane	*Grus canadensis pratensis*	-	T
American oystercatcher	*Haematopus palliatus*	-	SSC
Bald eagle	*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*	T	T
Wood stork	*Mycteria americana*	E	E
Brown pelican	*Pelecanus occidentalis*	-	SSC
Least tern	*Sterna antillarum*	-	T
Roseate tern	*Sterna dougalii*	T	T
Bachman's warbler	*Vermivora bachmanii*	E	E
Black skimmer	*Rynchops niger*	-	SSC
White ibis	*Eudocimus albus*	-	SSC
Mammals			
Florida mouse	*Podomys floridanus*	C2	SSC

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	
		Federal	State
West Indian (FL) manatee	*Trichechus manatus*	E	E

Fish			
Common snook	*Centropomus undecimalis*	-	SSC
Plants			
No State or Federally listed plant species are known to exist on MacDill AFB		-	-

T = Threatened, T(SA) = Threatened/Similarity of Appearance, E = Endangered,
SSC = Species of Special Concern, C2 = Candidate for listing
Source: Endangered Species Management Plan, MacDill AFB, Florida, 1996

3.7 SOCIOECONOMICS

The Economic Impact Region (EIR) for MacDill AFB is the geographic area within a 50-mile radius of the Base subject to significant Base-related economic impacts. The area includes all or part of Hillsborough, Pinellas, Polk, Pasco, Hardee, Manatee, Sarasota, and DeSoto Counties.

According to the 1998 Economic Resource Impact Statement for MacDill AFB, the Center for Economic and Management Research of the University of South Florida has estimated the total economic impact of MacDill AFB on the EIR as $3.5 billion with over 105,000 jobs supported. The two types of impacts the Base has on the economy are Base operations and retiree income.

Base operations require input of local labor, goods, and services. This impact supports approximately 41,000 jobs in the Tampa Bay region and provides a total annual economic impact of $1.34 billion. The direct impact on local income produced by Base expenditures is $494 million.

Retirees who have moved into the region because of the services provided to them by the Base place additional demands on all facets of the region's economy. Retiree income provides a total economic impact of $2.19 billion and supports over 64,000 jobs in the EIR. This total impact reflects retirees' spending patterns and the interaction with the economy this creates.

3.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural resources are prehistoric and historic sites. These resources consist of districts, buildings, structures and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. Historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are subject to protection or consideration by a federal agency in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

3.8.1 Prehistoric Resources

Five archaeological sites are on MacDill AFB. Their identifying numbers are 8HI49, a sand mound in the southeastern area of the Base at Gadsden Point that may have been destroyed during construction of the golf course; 8HI50, a shell mound in the southeastern area of the Base; 8HI3380 (Coon's Hammock Site), a Woodland-period shell midden in the southern area of the Base, adjacent to Coon's Hammock Creek; 8HI3382, an Archaic period site located near the flight line; and Site HI5656 (EOD area). Site 8HI3382 and portions of site 8HI50 have been determined by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to be eligible for listing in the NRHP. The remaining sites are not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

3.8.2 Historic Resources

Construction of MacDill AFB began in November 1939, and the Base was dedicated in April 1941. Sites and structures related to the early missions remain on Base today. Eligible for listing in the NRHP is the historic district that comprises the buildings along Hangar Loop. This district includes the five hangars and their associated support buildings that make up the proposed MacDill Field World War II-Era Historic District. The second area eligible for listing is the general officer housing area situated on Staff Loop adjacent to Bayshore Drive.

The existing Pelican Pier was not identified during the 1994 Historic American Building Survey as having historical or architectural significance, and was not considered potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Furthermore, examination of historical aerial photographs indicate that the area around the pier has changed dramatically since the 1950's, primarily due to the demolition of several buildings assocaiated with the Pier. Demolition of the support facilities around the Pier has irretrievably altered the historic context of the area. Consultation with the State historic Preservation Office confirmed that they do not find the Pier to have historical or

architectural significance. Final determination of this status was received from the State Historic Preservation Office and is provided in Appendix D.

3.9 LAND USE

Land use at MacDill AFB includes airfield, industrial, commercial, institutional (educational and medical), residential, recreational, and vacant land. The site proposed for the Pelican Pier is designated as industrial land use.

Directly adjacent to the northern boundary of MacDill AFB are urban portions of the City of Tampa. Tampa regulates planning, zoning, and the subdivision of land within its corporate boundaries, which do not include MacDill AFB.

Developed land is contiguous to portions of the northern Base boundary and is characterized by infilling of vacant and undeveloped land parcels, within an established grid street pattern. Adjacent land is privately owned and zoned by the City of Tampa for residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

3.10 TRANSPORTATION

MacDill AFB is currently served by four operating gates, through which all vehicular traffic is routed. The main gate is located at Dale Mabry Highway, with secondary gates at Bayshore Boulevard and MacDill Avenue. A 1998 Entry Gate Development Study (USAF) detailed traffic counts at the Dale Mabry and Bayshore gates during both morning and evening rush hours and during lunch hour. During the peak hours, over 4,400 vehicles pass through the Dale Mabry Gate, and over 1,800 vehicles travel through the Bayshore Gate. The Dale Mabry gate is open 24 hours per day. The Bayshore gate is open from 4:30 A.M. to 12:00 P.M. The MacDill Avenue gate is open from 5:30 A.M to 8:30 A.M. (during the morning peak hour), and traffic counts are not available for this gate. The fourth gate (Port Tampa Gate), located on the west side of the Base near Manhattan Avenue, has been reopened and is used as the sole entry point for commercial, contractor, delivery, and recreational vehicles. The Port Tamp gate is open from 8:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M., Saturday and Sunday, and from 5:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., Monday through Friday.

Traffic conditions on the roadways that access the Base are generally acceptable. However, sections of Bayshore Boulevard near Gandy Boulevard and sections of Gandy Boulevard west of Dale Mabry Highway currently operate at congested levels of service.

The transportation system on Base consists of arterials, collectors, and local streets that connect with the off-base network through the three gates. On-base arterial facilities include North and South Boundary Roads, Bayshore Boulevard, Marina Bay Drive, and Tampa Point Boulevard. The 1998 traffic study determined that service levels for traffic on Base are generally acceptable. However, modification to intersections along South Boundary Boulevard, Tampa Point Boulevard, and Marina Bay Drive would increase flow and safety.

3.11 AIRSPACE AND AIRFIELD OPERATIONS

The airspace region of influence includes the airspace within a 20-nautical-mile radius of MacDill AFB from the ground surface up to 10,000 feet above MSL. Radar monitoring and advisories within the region are provided by the Tampa Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON). There are 13 military and public airports, as well as five private use airports located within or adjacent to the controlled airspace associated with the MacDill AFB region of influence. No special use airspace exists within the region.

3.12 ACCIDENT POTENTIAL

MacDill AFB has a bird-aircraft strike hazard plan. It provides guidance for reducing the incidents of bird strikes in and around areas where flying operations occur. The plan establishes provisions to disperse information on specific bird hazards and procedures for reporting hazardous bird activity. The design and construction of any facilities within the vicinity of the airfield must comply with certain restrictions such as covering open water areas that may encourage bird foraging activity, and keeping grassed areas cut to regulation height.

3.13 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

3.13.1 Asbestos

The MacDill AFB Asbestos Management Plan identifies procedures for management and abatement of asbestos. Prior to renovations or demolition of existing non-residential buildings, asbestos sampling is performed by a contractor to determine the percent and type of asbestos in the material. The asbestos is removed prior to the demolition or renovation of any facility in accordance with applicable Federal and state regulations.

3.13.2 Lead-Based Paint

The Base engineer assumes that all structures constructed prior to 1978 possibly contain lead-based paint (LPB). Lead-based paint is defined by EPA and HUD as paint or other surface coating containing lead in concentrations of 1.0 mg/cm^2 or greater by x-ray fluoresence (XRF) testing, or concentrations of 0.5 percent by weight.

A LBP survey of family housing units and non-housing high priority facilities was completed in 1994. The survey identified LBP in 80 percent of the tested facilities. LBP abatement is accomplished in accordance with applicable Federal and state regulations prior to demolition activities to prevent any health hazards.

SECTION 4.0
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Implementation of the Proposed Action could impact the environment. Section 4.0 discusses the potential effects associated with implementation of the Proposed Action and the alternatives to the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is to construct a new Pelican Pier facility at the location proposed in Section 2.2. The Proposed Action also includes demolition of the existing structure (Facility 352) following completion of construction of the proposed pier and park. An alternative to implementing the Proposed Action is replacement of Pelican Pier in-kind. The No-Action Alternative was also considered as an alternative to the Proposed Action.

4.1 AIR QUALITY

4.1.1 Proposed Action

Air quality impacts would occur during construction of the new pier facility and demolition of the existing facility; however, these air quality impacts would be temporary.

Fugitive dust (particulate matter: suspended and PM_{10}) and construction vehicle exhaust emissions would be generated by the following: (1) equipment traffic; and (2) entrainment of dust particles by the action of the wind on exposed soil surfaces and debris. These emissions would be greater during the new area site grading. Emissions would vary on a daily basis, depending upon the specific activity being completed.

Dust would be generated by equipment travel over temporary roads and would fall rapidly within a short distance from the source.

The quantity of fugitive dust emissions from the construction site is proportional to the land being worked and the level of construction activity. USEPA has estimated that uncontrolled fugitive dust emissions from ground-disturbing activities would be emitted at a rate of 4.6 pounds per acre per working day or 0.05 tons per acre of construction per month of activity (USEPA, 1995). These emissions would produce slightly elevated short-term particulate concentrations, which would be

temporary, and would fall rapidly with distance from the source. For this project, the effects of dust generation would be minimized by the fact that much of the planned construction is occurring beyond the water line of the bay.

Chapter 62-296, Florida Administrative Code (FAC), requires that no person shall allow the emissions of unconfined particulate matter from any activity (including vehicular movement, transportation of materials, construction, demolition, or wrecking, etc.) without taking reasonable precautions to prevent such emissions. Reasonable precautions include the following:

- Paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, and yards;
- Applications of water or chemicals (i.e. foam) to control emissions from such activities such as demolition, grading roads, construction, and land clearing;
- Application of asphalt, water, or other dust suppressants to unpaved roads, yards, open stock piles, and similar areas;
- Removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under the control of the owner or operator of the facility to prevent re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to prevent particulates from becoming airborne; and
- Landscaping or planting of vegetation.

Pollutants from construction equipment and vehicle engine exhausts include nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), PM_{10}, and VOCs. Internal combustion engine exhausts would be temporary, and like fugitive dust emissions, would not result in long-term impacts. Pollutant emission estimates are presented in Appendix C and summarized in Table 4.1.1. The USEPA estimates that the effects of fugitive dust from construction activities would be reduced significantly with an effective watering program. Watering the disturbed area of the construction site twice per day with approximately 3,500 gallons per acre per day would reduce total suspended particle emissions by as much as 50 percent (USEPA, 1995)

Table 4.1.1 Proposed Action Air Emissions at MacDill AFB

Pollutant	Proposed Action Annual Emissions (tpy)	Hillsborough County Emissions Inventory[a] (tpy)	Net Change (%)	*De minimis* Values[c] (tpy)	Above/Below De minimis
CO	2.55	19,272	0.01	100	Below
VOC	1.40	27,703	0.005	100	Below
NO_X	3.37	82,563	0.004	100	Below
SO_X	0.18	NA	--	100	Below
PM_{10}[b]	0.33	NA	--	100	Below
Pb	--	53	--	25	--

a Based on stationary permitted emissions presented in 1997 Ozone Emissions Inventory, EPC.

b PM10 estimated as 50 percent of the 1990 tpy reported for TSP

c Source: 40 CFR 93.153, November 30, 1993.

tpy Tons per year

% Percent

4.1.1.1 Air Conformity Analysis

Federal actions must comply with the USEPA Final General Conformity Rule published in 40 CFR 93, Subpart B (for federal agencies) and 40 CFR 51 Subpart W (for state requirements). The Final Conformity Rule, which took effect on January 31, 1994, requires all Federal agencies to ensure that proposed agency activities conforms to an approved or promulgated SIP or Federal Implementation Plan (FIP). Conformity means compliance with a SIP or FIP for the purpose of attaining or maintaining NAAQS. Specifically, this means ensuring the Federal activity does not: 1) cause a new violation of the NAAQS; 2) contribute to an increase in the frequency or severity of violations of the existing NAAQS; 3) delay the timely attainment of any NAAQS; or 4) delay interim or other milestones contained in the SIP for achieving attainment.

The Final General Conformity Rule applies only to Federal actions in designated non-attainment or maintenance areas, and the rule requires that total direct and indirect emissions of non-attainment criteria pollutants, including ozone precursors, be considered in determining conformity. The rule does not apply to actions that are not considered regionally significant and where the total direct and indirect emissions of non-attainment criteria pollutants do not equal or exceed *de minimis* threshold levels for criteria pollutants established in 40 CFR 93.153(b). A Federal action would be considered regionally significant when the total emissions from the proposed action equaled or exceeded 10 percent of the non-attainment area's emissions inventory for any criteria air pollutant. If a Federal

action meets *de minimis* requirements and is not considered a regionally significant action, then it does not have to undergo a full conformity determination. Ongoing activities currently being conducted are exempt from the rule so long as there is not an increase in emissions above the *de minimis* levels as the result of the Federal action.

For purposes of analysis, it was assumed that the type and square footage of the Proposed Action construction are those specified in Section 2.2.2, for a total of 5,290 square feet of new construction (including allowance for seawall) plus approximatley 1,600 square feet of disturbed area around the margins of the construction site. In addition, it was assumed that approximately 5,400 square feet would be demolished, although the construction site and demolition site are the same. It was assumed that the period of construction was limited to six months. The annual emissions presented in Table 4.1.1 include the estimated annual PM_{10} emissions associated with implementation of the Proposed Action at MacDill AFB (see Appendix C).

The Proposed Action involves the construction of a new facility. Therefore, no increase in baseline emissions after construction completion would be anticipated.

An air conformity analysis was performed using the estimated annual emissions associated with the implementation of the Proposed Action. The estimated values for CO, VOCs, NO_x, SO_x, and PM_{10} were determined to be less than the USEPA *de minimis* values and less than 10 percent of the Hillsborough County emissions inventory (see Table 4.1.1).

A conformity determination under the CAA conformity rules is not required because of the following: 1) the preferred alternative is not regionally significant since Hillsborough County emissions will increase by less than 10 percent, and 2) the Proposed Action estimated emissions are below the *de minimis* values as stated in 40 CFR 93.153(b). Since the action's emissions are considered to be low, temporary, and insignificant, the Proposed Action would conform to the SIP.

4.1.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

The Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative would require the demolition and reconstruction of the pier; however, the type of air impacts would be similar to those generated by the Proposed

Action. In general, the volume of dust and pollutant emissions generated under this alternative should be similar to the Proposed Action. Any air impacts would be temporary and minor. Under this alternative, there would be no long-term impacts to air quality.

4.1.3 No-Action Alternative

Because the status quo would be maintained, there would be no impacts to air quality under the No-Action Alternative.

4.1.4 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

The cumulative air impacts would include air sources from other proposed construction projects on MacDill AFB. Tables 4A through 4D in Appendix C presents the estimated air emissions calculated for projects proposed for the near future, during the timeframe that construction and demolition activities would be completed. Based on the calculations provided in Appendix C, implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in cumulative air impacts that exceed guidance standards.

4.2 NOISE

The primary human response to environmental noise is annoyance (AIHA, 1986). The degree of annoyance has been found to correlate well with the DNL. Annoyance for short-term activities, such as construction noise or fire fighting, could be influenced by other factors such as awareness and attitude toward the activity creating the noise.

Several social surveys have been conducted in which people's reaction to their noise environment has been determined as a function of DNL occurring outside their homes. Guidelines have been developed for individual land uses based upon the information collected in these surveys and upon information concerning activity interference. For various land uses, the level of acceptability of the noise environment is dependent upon the activity that is conducted, and the resultant levels of annoyance, hearing loss, speech interference, and sleep interference.

4.2.1 Proposed Action

Noise impacts associated with the Proposed Action would result from construction of a new Pelican Pier facility and demolition of the existing structure. The degree of noise impacts would be a function of the noise generated by construction equipment, the location and sensitivity of nearby land uses, and the timing and duration of the noise-generating activities. Normally, construction activities are carried out in stages and each stage has its own noise characteristics based on the mixture of construction equipment in use.

The highest cumulative energy equivalent sound levels from construction activities are estimated to be approximately 85 dB at 50 feet from the center of the project site. Typical noise levels at 50 feet for various equipment that would be used during construction include: 80 dB for bulldozers, 83 dB for cranes, 85 dB for backhoes, and 91 dB for trucks (USEPA, 1971). The closest sensitive receptors are occupants of the nearby facilities within the Staff Historic District, located approximately 600 feet south of the Pier.

The adjacent receptors would probably experience noise impacts from construction and/or construction-related vehicles. The magnitude of these impacts would be directly tied to the proximity of the occupied facility to the construction or demolition site. In addition, the impacts vary according to the activity occurring on any particular day, and impacts would cease when construction is completed. Based on a cumulative average construction noise level of approximately 85 dB at 50 feet from the center of the project site, occupants of the residential facilities along Chevron Park Drive would be negatively impacted.

Under the Proposed Action, potential noise impacts would occur during the construction and demolition activities. However, these impacts are temporary and considered minor.

The overall noise level produced during operation of the proposed new Pelican Pier would be consistent with normal Base activities, and would be insignificant.

4.2.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

Noise impacts under this alternative would be similar to those described by the Proposed Action. Based on a cumulative average construction noise level of approximately 85 dB at 50 feet from the center of the project site, occupants of the residential facilities along Chevron Park Drive would be negatively impacted.

The overall noise level produced during operation of Pelican Pier under this Alternative would be consistent with normal Base activities, and would be insignificant.

4.2.3 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative no new noise impacts would occur since renovation or demolition would not occur, and the new Pelican Pier facility would not be constructed.

4.2.4 Cumulative Noise Impacts

The cumulative noise impacts would include noise sources from the proposed construction activities, and other construction projects that have been approved in the vicinity of the project area. Projects currently proposed for construction around the new Pelican Pier facility site include the Mission Planning facility. This construction project is approximately 600 feet away from Pelican Pier and would not result in significant cumulative noise impacts since noise levels attenuate quickly with distance from the point of generation. There are no other construction or demolition projects currently proposed in areas around Pelican Pier. Therefore, no additional noise impacts would be expected to result from the implementation of the Proposed Action beyond those discussed in Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.

Under the Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative, the noise impacts would be similar to those generated by implementing the Proposed Action, and no significant cumulative noise impacts would occur beyond those discussed in Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2. In general the noise increases for either alternative would be incremental and considered insignificant in comparison with the noise level present at an active AFB.

4.3 WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIAL, AND STORED FUEL

The following section describes sanitary wastewater treatment, solid waste collection and disposal, hazardous material and waste management, and stored fuels management.

4.3.1 Proposed Action

A temporary increase in the generation of solid waste would occur during construction of the proposed Pelican Pier facility and the demolition of the existing facility. Local off-base waste handling services/facilities have sufficient capacity to handle this increased output. The number of personnel on base would not increase by the Proposed Action; therefore, there would be no net change in solid waste generation upon completion of the project.

The new Pelican Pier facility includes a small restroom area that contains a sink and a toilet. There would be no increase in the number of personnel on the base under the Proposed Action. Consequently, the addition of this new restroom facility is not expected to increase the daily volume of wastewater treated by the wastewater treatment facility.

Hazardous wastes/materials, such as paint, adhesives, and solvents, would be on site during construction of the new pier. All hazardous wastes/materials would be temporarily stored and disposed of per Base procedures. All construction-related hazardous wastes/materials, including petroleum products, would be removed following the completion of tasks, and disposed of according to Base procedures. The disposal of such waste would be in compliance with established Base procedures. No impacts from hazardous materials or waste would occur during operation of the new pier facility.

The presence of lead-based paint and asbestos containing building materials have not been evaluated at the facility. Base engineering considers any building constructed prior to 1981 as likely containing asbestos, which would need to be removed by a licensed asbestos contractor in accordance with all Federal, state and local guidelines. Notwithstanding, as the Pier is primarily constructed of unpainted pressure treated lumber, relatively little if any asbestos containing

building materials and/or lead-based paints above applicable action levels are expected. However, in the event any suspect materials are encountered, Base Bio-Environmental Engineering will be immediately contacted, and appropriate testing and precautions will be taken.

There are no Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites within ¼-mile of the area identified for new construction. Therefore, there is no reason to suspect that contaminated soil or groundwater would be encountered during construction of the proposed Pelican Pier. However, if contaminated media are encountered during construction, the material would be managed in accordance with IRP guidelines, and would not represent a significant impact to the project.

The Proposed Action would have no impact on stored fuels management and environmental compliance at the Base.

4.3.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

Under this alternative the potential for encountering hazardous materials would be similar to the Proposed Action. For this Alternative, the existing seawall would be removed and replaced, an action similar in scope to that outlined in the Proposed Action. Therefore, the potential for encountering potentially hazardous wastes or contaminated soils would be similar. The Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative would have no impact on stored fuels at MacDill AFB.

4.3.3 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, no impacts to wastes or hazardous material or stored fuels would occur, as there would be no change in the existing conditions.

4.4 WATER RESOURCES

4.4.1 Proposed Action

A small amount of soil erosion would occur during construction and demolition activities since the soil surface would be exposed and disturbed at the pier location during the project. Soil erosion in areas that are disturbed would be controlled by implementation of a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan, including implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs). This EA has been prepared under the assumption that upon completion, the area landward of the seawall would, at a minimum,

be covered with a clean layer of graded and grassed fill. Erosion from this surface, once the fill is in place, would be minimal. There would be no long-term impact to water resources once the project is complete.

Under the Proposed Action, there would be no direct or indirect discharges to groundwater or surface water. No negative impacts to groundwater would occur with implementation of the Proposed Action. Potable water would be required for one restroom at the proposed pier; however, the amount of water required for these operations would not represent a significant impact to existing water supply on the AFB.

4.4.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

The impacts under this alternative would be similar to the Proposed Action and no impacts to groundwater resources would occur. Exposed soils along the embankment would be most vulnerable during the removal/replacement of the seawall; however, this exposure would be temporary. There would be no increase to potable water supply demands at the Base.

4.4.3 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, there would be no change to the current conditions and no impacts to water resources would occur with its implementation.

4.5 FLOODPLAINS

In accordance with the requirements of EO 11988, the Air Force must demonstrate that there is no practicable alternative to carrying out the proposed action within the floodpool or floodplain. No other practicable sites were identified during the initial siting phase, and potential siting locations were limited due to the nature of the project.

4.5.1 Proposed Action

The proposed Pelican Pier would be mostly located above the high tide line of Tampa Bay, and entirely located within the 100-year floodplain. Also, the land use designation for the area would not change since the site is already designated for use as a pier. A slight increase in impervious surface would occur from construction of the restroom facility and added parking spaces. This

increase in impervious surface would not represent a significant impact to the 100-year floodplain. The proposed new construction site, at the location of the existing pier, represents the most practicable site from engineering, cost, and logistical standpoints, and would produce no major negative impacts. Construction and operation of the Pelican Pier and seawall would not damage floodplain values, and would have minimal impact to fish and wildlife habitat, and water quality. The proposed new construction would not pose a threat to human life, health, or safety. Under the Proposed Action, no significant negative impacts to the floodplain would occur.

4.5.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

The impacts associated with implementation of the Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Action and no impacts to the floodplain would occur. The proposed construction of the seawall would have similar impact to fish and wildlife habitat than the Proposed Action, as the new seawall would be constructed landward of the existing seawall, buffering the construction from Hillsborough Bay. Therafter, the existing seawall would be removed.

4.5.3 No-Action Alternative

There would be no changes to existing conditions with implementation of the No-Action Alternative, and there would be no impacts to the floodplain.

4.6 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.6.1 Proposed Action

4.6.1.1 Wetlands

Implementation of the Proposed Action would have no impact on wetlands. The nearest wetlands are identified a mangrove swamps, and are located along the shoreline extending from the seawall in both directions away from the pier. However, stormwater and runoff from impervious surfaces

(i.e., parking, walkway to the pier) will be retained within internally drained structures. Silt fencing installed and maintained during site construction activities would eliminate incidental potential impacts to wetlands.

4.6.1.2 Wildlife

The Proposed Action could impact aquatic life due to an increase in turbidity in the surface water of Tampa Bay in the vicinity of the pier and seawall. The proposed construction work to repair the pier pilings would disturb bottom sediments and increase water turbidity. Increased water turbidity can impact aquatic animal life by altering feeding patterns and "choking" filter feeding organisms. Increased turbidity also impacts aquatic plant life by reducing the penetration of sunlight which, over an extended period, can kill aquatic plants, especially sea grasses which are common in the shallow areas throughout Tampa Bay. There are currently no sea grass beds in the immediate vicinity of the pier, presumably due to the deep water and historic dredging activities around the pier. The construction methods outlined for the Proposed Action would reduce turbidity impacts by installing turbidity control barriers around the entire perimeter of the approach pier and seawall. The turbidity control structures would keep the turbid water contained within the work area and eliminate water quality impacts outside of the immediate vicinity of the pier and seawall.

The repairs to the pilings would also impact aquatic animal life by eradicating the mini-ecosystems that exist on the wood pilings. The pilings are covered with barnacles and other sea life that the shellfish and fish in the area feed on and depend on for subsistence. Over time, however, the barnacles and sea life would establish themselves on the new pilings and the mini-ecosystem would be rebuilt.

4.6.1.3 Listed Species Habitat

Section 3.6.4 lists the Federal- and State-listed species that potentially occur at MacDill AFB. A bald eagle's nest is located approximately 4,500 feet to the southeast of the existing facility, well outside of the 1,500 feet clearance zone. Additionally, the area of the proposed pier is subject to intermittent visits from the West Indian Manatee (*Trichechus manatus)*. A Manatee Protection Plan would be implemented during site construction.

No other Federal or state-listed species or species critical habitat is present at the proposed construction and demolition sites or would be impacted by the project. Coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been completed to insure compliance with the Endangered Species Act and confirm that the project would have no impact on listed species.

4.6.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

The impacts associated with the Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative would be similar to those for the Proposed Action. Consequently, no impacts to biological resources would occur under this Alternative.

4.6.3 No Action Alternative

No new construction or demolition would occur with implementation of the No Action alternative and no impacts to biological resources would occur.

4.7 SOCIOECONOMICS

4.7.1 Proposed Action

The new Pelican Pier would cost approximately $2.0 million to construct, including the cost of demolition and removal of the existing pier, based on 2002 cost estimates. This would equal less than 1 percent of the nearly $494 million annual expenditures that MacDill AFB provides to the local economy, and would constitute a minor beneficial impact. The Proposed Action would also have a minor beneficial impact on the work force in the region during the construction period.

4.7.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

Renovating and expanding the existing facility would cost approximately $2.2 million to construct, including the cost of removal of the existing pier, based on 2002 cost estimates. This Alternative would increase the overall scope of the project by approximately $200,000. The cost associated with the Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative still represents less than 1 percent of the nearly $494 million annual expenditures that MacDill AFB provides to the local economy, and would therefore constitute a minor beneficial impact.

4.7.3 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, no impacts to socioeconomic resources would be incurred.

4.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.8.1 Proposed Action

Pelican Pier is not an historic structure. The State Historic Preservation Office concurs with MacDill AFB's assessment that the pier has no value as a cultural resource. Consequently, no historic architectural or archeological resources would the impacted with implementation of the Proposed Action.

4.8.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

No historic architectural or archeological resources would be impacted if the Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative were to be implemented.

4.8.3 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, no impacts to cultural resources would be incurred.

4.9 LAND USE

4.9.1 Proposed Action

The proposed Pelican Pier would be constructed within the littoral zone along Tampa Bay, at the location of the existing pier. The land around the proposed construction site is designated as open land use. This designation would change to operational land use with construction of the new pier.

4.9.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

The land around the proposed construction site is designated as open land use. This designation would change to operational land use with the implementation of this Alternative.

4.9.3 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, no impacts to land use would be incurred.

4.10 TRANSPORTATION

4.10.1 Proposed Action

There would be a temporary negative impact from construction vehicles during construction of the new facility, and during the demolition of the existing pier. The construction impacts would be temporary, and the level of service of Base roads would not decline. The operation of the new pier would have minimal long-term impact on transportation on MacDill AFB, since there would be no net increase in traffic resulting from personnel changes.

4.10.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

The impacts on transportation for this alternative would be similar to those identified for the Proposed Action. Consequently, minimal long-term impacts on transportation would be incurred with implementation of this alternative.

4.10.3 No-Action Alternative

No impacts on transportation would be incurred under the No-Action Alternative.

4.11 AIRSPACE/AIRFIELD OPERATIONS AND BIRD-AIRCRAFT STRIKE HAZARD

None of the alternatives considered would have an impact on Airspace/Airfield Operations or Bird-Aircraft Strike Hazard.

4.12 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

4.12.1 Proposed Action

The proposed construction activities for the project would pose safety hazards to the workers similar to those associated with typical industrial construction projects, such as falls, slips, heat stress, and machinery injuries. Workers should follow current guidance when handling pressure treated lumber, either from the existing or the new pier. In addition, the project has the atypical concern of work over and adjacent to water. Nevertheless, construction would not involve any unique hazards and all construction methods would comply with OSHA requirements to ensure the protection of workers and the general public during construction. Vigilant, but not controlling, governmental oversight of contractor activities would help assure OSHA compliance.

The demolition portion of the project is not anticipated to encounter lead-based paint and asbestos containing building material. As Pelican Pier is primarily constructed of unpainted pressure treated lumber, relatively little if any asbestos containing building materials and/or lead-based paints above applicable action levels are expected. However, in the event any suspect materials are encountered, Base Bio-Environmental Engineering will be immediately contacted, and appropriate testing and precautions will be taken. Disposal manifests of any wastes generated shall be turned over to the government upon completion of the demolition work.

The construction of the new facility and the demolition of the existing pier would involve limited excavation activities. Encountering contaminated media is not anticipated during these activities. In the event that contaminated media are encountered, the base Installation Restoration Program shall be contacted and the magnitude of the contamination evaluated. Thereafter, proper precautions can typically be taken during excavation activities so that the proposed excavation activities would not represent a significant health and safety concern. These actions may include the use of approved personal protective equipment (PPE) and clothing. At that time, the construction contractor would be required to develop a site-specific Health & Safety Plan prior to implementing these actions and continuing construction activities at the site. If these precautions were implemented as described, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on worker health and safety.

4.12.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

The proposed construction activities for the project would pose safety hazards to the workers similar to those associated with the Proposed Action. As with the Proposed Action, workers should follow current guidance when handling pressure treated lumber, either from the existing or the new pier. In addition, the project has the atypical concern of work over and adjacent to water. Construction would not involve any unique hazards and all construction methods would comply with OSHA requirements to ensure the protection of workers and the general public during construction. Vigilent, but not controling governmental oversight of contractor activities would help assure OSHA compliance.

The replacement of the existing pier is not anticipated to, but may encounter asbestos containing building material and/or lead-base paint. As Pelican Pier is primarily constructed of unpainted pressure treated lumber, relatively little if any asbestos containing building materials and/or lead-based paints above applicable action levels are expected. However, in the event any suspect materials are encountered, Base Bio-Environmental Engineering will be immediately contacted, and appropriate testing and precautions will be taken. Again, any disposal manifests of wastes generated shall be turned over to the government upon completion of the demolition work. If these precautions were implemented as described, the Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative would not have a significant impact of worker health and safety.

The construction of the new facility and the demolition of the existing pier would involve limited excavation activities. Encountering contaminated media is not anticipated during these activities. In the event that contaminated media are encountered, the base Installation Restoration Program shall be contacted and the magnitude of the contamination evaluated. Thereafter, proper precautions can typically be taken during excavation activities so that the proposed excavation activities would not represent a significant health and safety concern. These actions may include the use of approved personal protective equipment (PPE) and clothing. At that time, the construction contractor would be required to develop a site-specific Health & Safety Plan prior to implementing these actions and continuing construction activities at the site. If these precautions were implemented as described, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on worker health and safety.

4.12.3 No-Action Alternative

No impacts on safety and occupational health would be incurred under the No-Action Alternative.

4.13 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

4.13.1 Proposed Action

There would be not significant impacts to geology. Soils exposed during site grading and construction activities are subject to erosion and a small amount of soil erosion is expected during construction and demolition activities since portions of the soil surface would be exposed and disturbed. Soil erosion in areas that are disturbed would be controlled by implementation of a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan, including implementation of BMPs.

This EA has been prepared under the assumption that all non-impervious areas disturbed during construction and demolition activities would, at a minimum, be covered with a clean layer of graded and grassed fill. Covering the areas of exposed soil created during construction and demolition with sod would significantly reduce the potential for erosion. Overall, the impacts to soils would be minimal and temporary and are not considered significant.

4.13.2 Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative

The impacts on geology and soils for this alternative would be similar to those identified for the Proposed Action. Consequently, there would be no impacts on geology and the impacts to soil would be temporary and minimal with implementation of this alternative.

4.13.3 No-Action Alternative

No impacts to geology and soil would be incurred with implementation of the No-Action Alternative.

4.14 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Providing a new Pelican Pier facility and demolishing one the existing structure would not affect minority or low-income populations. There are no minority or low-income populations in the area

around the proposed construction and demolition site; and thus, there will be no disproportionately high or adverse impacts on such populations. No adverse environmental impacts would occur outside MacDill AFB. Therefore, no adverse effects on minority and low-income populations would occur as a result of providing a new Pelican Pier facility and demolishing one existing structure at MacDill AFB.

4.15 INDIRECT AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

There are no site-specific direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts associated with constructing a new Pelican Pier facility, or demolishing the existing pier at MacDill AFB.

4.16 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

There are no significant unavoidable adverse impacts associated with construction of a new Pelican Pier facility or demolition of the existing pier at MacDill AFB.

4.17 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Construction of the new Pelican Pier facility would have a positive effect on the base by providing an enhanced park area for base personnel and conference attendee to gather and view the bay and Tampa vistas. Demolition of the existing pier would create space for the construction of the new pier.

4.18 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Construction of the new Pelican Pier facility would irreversibly commit the existing pier area to operational use. In addition, fuels, manpower, materials, and costs related to construction and demolition under the Proposed Action or the Replace Pelican Pier In-Kind Alternative would also be irreversibly lost.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 5.0
PERSONS CONTACTED

Scott Davis	6 CES/CECE MacDill AFB, FL 33621 1-813-828-8681
Steve Boyd	6 CES/CEPP MacDill AFB, FL 33621 1-813-828-2543
Mark Tyl	6 CES/CECE MacDill AFB, FL 33621 1-813-828-0456
Laura Kammerer	Division of Historical Resources Compliance Review Section 500 S Bronough St. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250 1-800-847-7278
Jack Moore	Southwest Florida Water Management District 7601 U.S. Highway 301 North Tampa, FL 33637 1-813-985-7481
Lenard Paris	USCOE Mobile District P.O. Box 6230 MacDill AFB, FL 33608-6230 1-813-840-2809
Brian Pridgen	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 9549 Koger Blvd Suite 111 St. Petersburg, FL 33702 1-727-570-5398
Isaac Chandler	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission 3900 Dranefield Road Lakeland. FL 33811 1-863-648-3203

Jasmine Raffington	FL Coastal Management Program Florida State Clearing House 2555 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100 1-850-414-6568
David Dale	National Man Fisheries Services 9721 Executive Center Drive North St. Petersburg, FL 33702
Steve West	Florida Department of Environmental Protection Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems 3900 Commonwealth Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-3000

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 6.0
LIST OF PREPARERS

Mr. R. Daniel Lewis, P.G.
LAW Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc.
4919 West Laurel Street
Tampa, Florida 33607
Voice: (813) 289-0570
FAX: (813) 289-5474

Ms. Kelly L. Bishop
LAW Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc.
4919 West Laurel Street
Tampa, Florida 33607
Voice: (813) 289-0570
FAX: (813) 289-5474

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207
Voice: (813) 828-0459
FAX: (813) 828-2212
e-mail: jason.kirkpatrick@macdill.af.mil

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 7.0
REFERENCES

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1986	*36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties.* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
American Weather Service (AWS), 1993	AWS Climatic Brief, Air Force Combat Climatology Center, Air Weather Service, Scott AFB, NOVEMBER 1993.
Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI), 1996	Florida Natural Areas Inventory, 1996. Biological Survey of MacDill Air Force Base.
United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 1988	Gap Filling PM_{10} Emission Factors for Selected open Area Dust Sources (EPA-450/4-88-003), United States Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, February 1988.
USAF, 1992	U.S. Air Force, 1986. *From the 1940s to Now ... A Historical Synopsis of the 56th Tactical Training Wing .... And MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.* 56 FW Historian's Office, MacDill AFB.
USAF, 1994	U.S. Air Force, 1994. Environmental Assessment, Transfer and Reuse of Part of MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
USAF, 2000	U.S. Air Force, 2000. Environmental Assessment for Implementation of the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
USAF, 1999	U.S. Air Force, 1999. DRAFT Title V Permit No. 0570141-001-AV MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
USAF, 1997	Economic Resource Impact Statement MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
USAF, 2000	U.S. Air Force, 2000. Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP) MacDill Air Force, Florida
USAF, 1995	Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources, 5th Edition (AP-42), United States Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, January 1995 (Supplement A, February 1996).

USAF, 1998 — U.S. Air Force, 1998. Interim Remedial Action/Closure Report for Underground Storage Tank Removal and Facility Demolition: Site 56 and Site 32. MacDill AFB, Florida, April 1998.

USAF, 1998 — U.S. Air Force, 1998. Environmental Compliance Assessment and Management Program (ECAMP), MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

USAF, 1996 — U.S. Air Force, 1996. Biological Survey of MacDill Air Force Base – Final Report

USAF, 1996 — U.S. Air Force, 1996. Endangered Species Management Plan MacDill Air Force Base, Florida

USAF, 1996 — U.S. Air Force, 1996. Environmental Assessment for the Replacement of Military Family Housing MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

USAF, 1996 — U.S. Air Force, 1996. Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

USAF, 1996 — U.S. Air Force, 1996. Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study, MacDill AFB, Tampa.

USAF, 1998 — U.S. Air Force, 1998. Delineation Study of the Waters of the United States Including the Landward Extent of Wetlands and Surface Waters MacDill Air Force Base Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida.

USAF, 1998 — U.S. Air Force, 1998. Entry Gate Development Study MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

USEPA, 1995 — Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources, 5th Edition (AP-42), USEPA, Research Triangle Park, January 1995 (Supplement A, February 1996).

USEPA, 1985 — Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume II: Mobile Sources, 4th Edition (AP-42), USEPA, Ann Arbor, September 1985, (Supplement A, January 1991).

USEPA, 1971 — Noise from Construction Equipment and Operation, Building Equipment and Home Appliances

State of Florida, 1981 — Florida Coastal Management Program

FIGURES

APPENDIX A

CONSISTENCY STATEMENT

APPENDIX A
CONSISTENCY STATEMENT

This consistency statement will examine the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and ascertain the extent to which the consequences of the Proposed Action are consistent with the objectives of Florida Coastal Management Program (CMP).

Of the Florida Statutory Authorities included in the CMP, impacts in the following areas are addressed in the EA: beach and shore preservation (Chapter 161), historic preservation (Chapter 267), economic development and tourism (Chapter 288), public transportation (Chapters 334 and 339), saltwater living resources (Chapter 370), living land and freshwater resource (Chapter 372), water resources (Chapter 373), environmental control (Chapter 403), and soil and water conservation (Chapter 582). This consistency statement discusses how the proposed options may meet the CMP objectives.

CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

Chapter 161: Beach and Shore Preservation

No disturbances to the base's canals are foreseen under the Proposed Action or Alternative Actions.

Chapter 267: Historic Preservation

The Air Force and the Florida State Historic Preservation Officer have determined that the Proposed Action will have no effect on historic properties associated with the Base.

Chapter 288: Economic Development and Tourism

The EA presents the new employment impact and net income impact of the Proposed Action and alternative. The options would not have significant adverse effects on any key Florida industries or economic diversification efforts.

Chapter 372: Saltwater Living Resources

The EA addresses potential impacts to local water bodies. Water quality impacts were surveyed for existing conditions at the Proposed Action and alternatives. Results indicate that no impacts would result from the Proposed Action or alternatives.

Chapter 372: Living Land and Freshwater Resources

Threatened and endangered species, major plant communities, conservation of native habitat, and mitigation of potential impacts to the resources are addressed in the EA. The Proposed Action and alternatives would not result in permanent disturbance to native habitat and should not significantly impact threatened or endangered species.

Chapter 373: Water Resources

There would be no impacts to surface water or groundwater quality under the Proposed Action or alternatives as discussed in the EA.

Chapter 403: Environmental Control

The EA addresses the issues of conservation and protection of environmentally sensitive living resources; protection of groundwater and surface water quality and quantity; potable water supply; protection of air quality; minimization of adverse hydrogeologic impacts; protection of endangered or threatened species; solid, sanitary, and hazardous waste disposal; and protection of floodplains and wetlands. Where impacts to these resources can be identified, possible mitigation measures are suggested. Implementation of mitigation will, for the most part, be the responsibility of MacDill AFB.

Chapter 582: Soil and Water Conservation

The EA addresses the potential of the Proposed Action and alternatives to disturb soil and presents possible measures to prevent or minimize soil erosion. Impacts to groundwater and surface water resources also are discussed in the EA.

CONCLUSION

The Air Force finds that the conceptual Proposed Action and alternatives plans presented in the EA are consistent with Florida's CMP.

APPENDIX B

AIR FORCE FORM 813

REQUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Report Control Symbol RCS: 16402-12

INSTRUCTIONS: *Section I to be completed by Proponent; Sections II and III to be completed by Environmental Planning Function. Continue on separate sheets as necessary. Reference appropriate item number(s).*

SECTION I - PROPONENT INFORMATION

1. TO *(Environmental Planning Function)*	2. FROM *(Proponent organization and functional address symbol)*	2a. TELEPHONE NO.
6 CES/CEV	6 CES/CEVN	(813) 828-4260

3. TITLE OF PROPOSED ACTION
Repair Pelican Pier Marine Patrol Dock

4. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION *(Identify decision to be made and need date)*
See Attached.

5. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES *(DOPAA) (Provide sufficient details for evaluation of the total action.)*
See Attached.

6. PROPONENT APPROVAL *(Name and Grade)*	6a. SIGNATURE	6b. DATE
Jason Kirkpatrick	Jason Kirkpatrick	12 Jun 02

SECTION II - PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY.

(Check appropriate box and describe potential environmental effects including cumulative effects.) (+ = positive effect; 0 = no effect; - = adverse effect; U= unknown effect)

	+	0	-	U
7. AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONE/LAND USE *(Noise, accident potential, encroachment, etc.)* Wlk 6/13/02		X		
8. AIR QUALITY *(Emissions, attainment status, state implementation plan, etc.)* 6/13/02				X
9. WATER RESOURCES *(Quality, quantity, source, etc.)* 13 Jun 02		X		
10. SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH *(Asbestos/radiation/chemical exposure, explosives safety quantity-distance, etc.)* 13 Jun 02		X		
11. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTE *(Use/storage/generation, solid waste, etc.)* 13 JUN 02		X		
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES *(Wetlands/floodplains, flora, fauna, etc.)* Wlk 6/13/02				X
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES *(Native American burial sites, archaeological, historical, etc.)* Wlk 6/13/02		X		
14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS *(Topography, minerals, geothermal, Installation Restoration Program, seismicity, etc.)* within vicinity of AOC 80 (Former Skeet Range) *potential lead & other trace metals in soil AFB 7/7/02				X
15. SOCIOECONOMIC *(Employment/population projections, school and local fiscal impacts, etc.)* Wlk 6/13/02		X		
16. OTHER *(Potential impacts not addressed above.)*				

SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS DETERMINATION

17.
- [ ] PROPOSED ACTION QUALIFIES FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CATEX) # _____ ; OR
- [X] PROPOSED ACTION DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR A CATEX; FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED.

18. REMARKS
MacDill AFB is located in a maintenance area for the following criteria pollutants: Ozone. Direct emissions from construction and indirect emissions from visiting traffic and/or follow-on operations, when totaled are less than the deminimus amounts in 40 CFR 93.153, therefore, a conformity determination is not required.

19. ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING FUNCTION CERTIFICATION *(Name and Grade)*	19a. SIGNATURE	19b. DATE
MARK J MEYERS, Colonel, USAF Vice Commander, 6 AMW	M J Meyers	25 Jun 02

4. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION:

The MacDill AFB Crash Dock, known as Pelican Pier, was constructed in the 1950's and is severely worn with age. Damage to the pier includes "washouts" behind the seawall, uneven and weathered planks, and corroded piling. Wing Safety has determined the pier to be structurally unsafe and has placed the pier off-limits. MacDill AFB recently established a Security Forces Marine Patrol that actively patrols the base shoreline. The marine patrol has a need for a permanent landing/docking facility on the east side of the base to stage their marine operations, enforce the 1000-yard coastal exclusion zone, and permit a rapid response time to potential threats along MacDill's eastern shoreline.

5. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Proposed Action - Demolish the existing piers and seawall and construct a new, redesigned pier and seawall system. The layout of the new pier and seawall would be constructed in the same area as the existing piers but would be redesigned slightly to meet the current operational needs of the Security Forces Marine Patrol. The proposed dock area would be reduced to only one pier which would be approximately as long as the existing piers that will be removed. In addition, the total length of seawall would be reduced and replaced with rip-rap or naturally vegetated shoreline. A floating dock would be attached to the new pier to make entry/exit from the small marine patrol boats easier.

Replace Pelican Pier In Kind - One alternative considered is replacement of Pelican Pier without modification of the existing layout. This alternative would demolish the existing seawall and piers and replace them with identical structures including approximately 650 feet of seawall, 650 feet of dock parallel to the seawall, and two piers approximately 200 feet long each. The existing seawall, that would be replaced in-kind, consists of two areas; one length approximately 450 feet long and generally oriented north/south and a perpendicular length at the south end approximately 200 feet long. A new seawall would be constructed behind the existing seawall before the existing wall is removed. The existing piling would be removed and replaced with new piling. The existing decking and support structures would be removed and replaced.

No Action Alternative - No improvements or rebuild of Pelican Pier would occur. The pier would remain unused and off-limits and would continue to deteriorate with age. The Security Force Marine Patrol would not have a docking area on the east side of the base which would severely limit their ability to respond to threats along MacDill's eastern shoreline in a timely manner.

APPENDIX C

AIR EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS FOR PROPOSED ACTION
AND CUMMULATIVE AIR EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS

APPENDIX D

PUBLIC NOTICE
AND AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

THE TAMPA TRIBUNE
Published Daily
Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida

State of Florida }
County of Hillsborough } ss.

Before the undersigned authority personally appeared J. Rosenthal, who on oath says that she is Advertising Billing Manager of The Tampa Tribune, a daily newspaper published at Tampa in Hillsborough County, Florida; that the attached copy of advertisement being a

LEGAL NOTICE

in the matter of PUBLIC NOTICE

was published in said newspaper in the issues of NOVEMBER 28, 2002

Affiant further says that the said The Tampa Tribune is a newspaper published at Tampa in said Hillsborough County, Florida, and that the said newspaper has heretofore been continuously published in said Hillsborough County, Florida, each day and has been entered as second class mail matter at the post office in Tampa, in said Hillsborough County, Florida for a period of one year next preceding the first publication of the attached copy of advertisement; and affiant further says that she has neither paid nor promised any person, this advertisement for publication in the said newspaper.

J. Rosenthal

Sworn to and subscribed by me, this 29 day of NOVEMBER, A.D. 20 02

Personally Known ✓ or Produced Identification _____
Type of Identification Produced _____

Susie Lee Slaton

NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF FLORIDA
OFFICIAL NOTARY SEAL
SUSIE LEE SLATON
COMMISSION NUMBER
DD000060
MY COMMISSION EXP.
APRIL 16, 2005

PUBLIC NOTICE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
Notice of Availability
The Air Force is inviting public review and comment on the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and supporting Environmental Assessment (EA) drafts for three proposed construction projects at MacDill Air Force Base. The three projects are: 1) construct/demolish a Military Dog Kennel Facility 2) construct a new landing/docking facility, and 3) construction vehicle inspection areas at four entry gates (Dale Mabry Highway, MacDill Avenue (Ave.), Bayshore Avenue, and Port Tampa). These documents are part of the Air Force environmental impact analysis process to satisfy requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). All three FONSI and supporting EA drafts are available for public review and comment beginning November 28th, 2002 at the Tampa/Hillsborough County Public Library, located at 900 N. Ashley Drive, Tampa, FL 33606 or the University of Tampa Merl Kelce Library located at 401 West Kennedy Boulevard, Tampa, FL 33602. The documents may be found in the Humanities Section of the Main Library. The comment period will close on December 28th, 2002. Address written comments to the 6ARW Public Affairs, 8209 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 14, MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5502. The telephone number is (813) 828-2215.
4575 11/28/02

MACDILL
106-USAF-MD
2002-8253

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
6TH AIR MOBILITY WING (AMC)
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

AUG 1 4 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR DIVISION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

FROM: 6 CES/CD
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive
MacDill AFB 33621-5207

SUBJECT: Demolish the Existing MacDill Air Force Base (AFB) Crash Dock (Pelican Pier) and Seawall and Construct a New, Redesigned Pier and Seawall System

1. The U.S. Air Force intends to demolish the existing piers and seawall and construct a new, redesigned pier and seawall system. The layout of the new pier and seawall would be constructed in the same area as the existing piers but would be redesigned slightly to meet the current operational needs of the Security Forces Marine Patrol. The proposed dock area would be reduced to only one pier which would be approximately as long as the existing piers that would be removed. In addition, the total length of seawall would be reduced to approximately 150 feet in length and the remaining replaced with rip-rap or naturally vegetated shoreline. A floating dock would be attached to the new pier to make entry/exit from the small marine patrol boats easier. A restroom/storage facility is proposed which would be connected to existing power, water and sewer services.

2. A representative from MacDill AFB's Natural Resources staff surveyed the site to determine if any cultural resources would be affected. No cultural resources were observed on the site and the site is not located in one of MacDill's Historic Districts. Consequently, MacDill AFB believes that the proposed construction project would not adversely impact cultural resources. If the State Historical Preservation Office agrees with this assessment, please document your concurrence by signing where indicated below. If you would like to inspect the proposed construction site, please contact the MacDill AFB Natural Resources staff.

3. If you have any question about the construction activities associated with Pelican Pier, please contact Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

STEVEN T. OLSON, CMSgt, USAF
Acting Deputy Base Civil Engineer

Attachments:

Figure 1 –Pier Location, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida
Figure 2 - Proposed Building Layout
Figure 3 - Site Plan and Proposed Construction/Demolition

Lewis, Dan

From: Kelly Bishop
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2002 9:41
To: Dan Lewis
Subject: FW: Pelican Pier

-----Original Message-----
From: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVN [mailto:Jason.Kirkpatrick@macdill.af.mil]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2002 7:54 AM
To: Kelly Bishop
Subject: RE: Pelican Pier

Kelly;

"Pelican Pier was not identified during the 1994 Historic American Building Survey as having historical or architectural significance and was not considered potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Place. Furthermore, examination of historical aerial photographs indicate that the pier has changed dramatically since the 1950's primarily due to the demolition of several buildings associated with the pier. Demolition of the support facilities around the pier has irretrievably altered the historic context of the area. Consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office confirmed that they do not find the pier to have historical or architectural significance. Written correspondence with the SHPO can be found in Appendix ____."

Jason K

> -----Original Message-----
> **From:** Kelly Bishop [mailto:KBISHOP@kennesaw.Lawco.com]
> **Sent:** Thursday, October 10, 2002 3:01 PM
> **To:** Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVN
> **Cc:** Dan Lewis
> **Subject:** Pelican Pier
>
> Hi Jason:
>
> We are finalizing the Pier and would appreciate a small narrative from you concerning your conversation with SHPO. Any assistance would be greatly appreciated!
>
> Thanks,
> k-

Lewis, Dan

From: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVN [Jason.Kirkpatrick@macdill.af.mil]
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2002 8:08 AM
To: Lewis, Dan
Cc: Bishop, Kelly
Subject: FW: Review Comments for the Draft Environmental Assessment, Pelican Pier, MacDill AFB, FL (Your Memo, 7 Nov 02)

Comments on Pelican Pier EA. - Late. Nothing big.

-----Original Message-----
From: Tyler Alexis R GS-4 AMC/CEVQ
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2002 3:54 PM
To: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVN
Cc: AMC/CEV.; AMC/CEVP; Carlon David Lt Col AMC/CEVP; Beller Wayland Maj AMC/CEVP
Subject: Review Comments for the Draft Environmental Assessment, Pelican Pier, MacDill AFB, FL (Your Memo, 7 Nov 02)

<<Pelican Pier EA Comments Letter.doc>>

Dan Lewis

From: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVN [Jason.Kirkpatrick@macdill.af.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2002 8:55 AM
To: Dan Lewis
Subject: FW: Pelican Pier

Comments from the Base Public Affairs office on Pelican Pier EA - Include in Correspondence Appendix for the Pier EA Final.

Jason K

-----Original Message-----
From: Green Diane GS-9 6 AMW/PA
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2002 2:30 PM
To: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVN
Subject: Pelican Pier

Jason, Here's what I caught.

<<Environmental Assessment on Pelican Pier.doc>>

Diane

Environmental Assessment on Pelican Pier

Page 5

Change Logistics Group to Maintenance Group
Change Support Group to Mission Support Group

Page 34

Transportation:
Dale Mabry is the only gate open 24 hours a day
Bayshore is only open from 0430-1200 Daily
MacDill is open only from 0530-0830
The Manhattan Gate is used during the day for vendors. The operating hours are 8-Noon Saturday and Sunday and 0530-1700 During the week.

Page 41

Second paragraph, 5th line needs a space between , and although the construction .....

Lewis, Dan

From: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVN [Jason.Kirkpatrick@macdill.af.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2002 1:56 PM
To: Dan Lewis
Subject: FW: Pelican Pier - Legal Review of EA

Base legal office comments - none. Print and put in appendix.

-----Original Message-----
From: Hughes Troy E Capt 6AMW/JA
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2002 8:40 AM
To: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVN
Cc: Otero Colleen Civ 6 AMW/JA
Subject: Pelican Pier - Legal Review of EA

Jason:

Here is the legal review on the Pelican Pier EA. Let me know if you need anything else. Thanks.

<<EA - Pelican Pier.doc>> Troy

Troy E. Hughes, Capt, USAF
6 AMW/JA
Assistant Staff Judge Advocate
8208 Hangar Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621
DSN 968-8794
Comm (813) 828-8794
Fax 828-9294

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
6TH AIR MOBILITY WING (AMC)
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE FLORIDA

10 December 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR 6 CES/CEVN

FROM: 6 AMW/JA

SUBJECT: Legal Review of Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Finding of No Practicable Alternative – Pelican Pier

1. After reviewing the draft EA for Construction/Demolition of the Pelican Pier, I find it legally sufficient.

2. To satisfy the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4370d, the Draft EA discusses the need for replacing the current pier and seawall that are severly worn with age and exposure with a new pier and seawall to meet the needs of the Security Forces Marine Patrol for a landing/docking facility on the east side of the base.

a. The Draft EA also describes the reasonable alternatives to this action, the affected environment, the environmental consequences of the proposed action and the alternative, and lists the agencies and persons consulted during its preparation. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis to demonstrate that the environmental impacts of the proposed action are not significant. Therefore, a FONSI is appropriate and an Environmental Impact Statement is unnecessary. In addition, the package also serves to aid MacDill AFB in complying with goals of NEPA as it pursues the action. Finally, it is written clearly enough for the public to understand the proposed action and its environmental consequences.

b. As required by Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, the FONPA indicates that there are no practicable alternatives to the proposed action and requires the AF to minimize the adverse impacts to the floodplains. It is noted that the proposed new pier and seawall dog would be located in the 100 year floodplain but the land use designation would not change since the site is already designated for use as a pier. The slight increase in impervious surface that would occur from the construction of the restroom facility and added parking spaces does not significantly impact the floodplain. The small amount of soil erosion that is to occur during demolition/construction pose no long-term impact to water resources once the project is complete.

3. In conclusion, the Draft EA package for constructing a new and demolishing the old pelican pier complies with Federal law, regulation and policy. If I may be of further assistance in this matter, I can be reached at 8-8794.

TROY E. HUGHES, Capt, USAF
Chief, Civil Law

Lewis, Dan

From: Kelly Bishop
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2002 8:53 AM
To: Dan Lewis
Subject: FW: Pelican Pier Questions

-----Original Message-----
From: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVN
[mailto:Jason.Kirkpatrick@macdill.af.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2002 4:50 PM
To: Kelly Bishop
Subject: RE: Pelican Pier Questions

Kelly;

1. That project is the Mission Planning Center project. The project will construct a 31,054 square foot masonry structure with stucco finsh and clay tile roof. Foundation will be 11 ft above msl to comply with FEMA. The building will contain multi-conference rooms, audio visual equipment rooms, storage, administration areas and a kitchen. A 31,000 SF parking lot will be constructed too. Total are of construction is approvimately 6.1 acres. Stormwater retention pond will be constructed. The facility will be used by the Air Force for meeting, conferences and seminars for AF personnel around the country.

2. Yes, those are residential (although my map has them labeled as Bldg 454 - 490). I don't see #359 on my map and it is not on the facility inventory (typo?) if not - where is it, what is it next too?

3. No archeological sites in the area. The Staff Circle Historic District is located 600 feet south of the pier. (The SHPO may feel that the pier to be historic since it was constructed in 1942 and really was part of the early mission here - "one a day in Tampa Bay" was the old slogan - i.e. they would have to send the crash rescue boat out daily to recover a plane the crashed into the bay - the pier may have been modified enough over the years to have destroyed its historic context. I guess we'll have to see).

4. The figure I have doesn't have a designation for the pier. The surrounding area is community commercial and residential. I would consider the pier recreational right now since it has been used for fishing for the last 10 year or so.

Hope this helps. I'll call you about the SHPO at some point, I'm getting some hassle from them on another project regarding Capehart & Wherry Housing.

Jason K

-----Original Message-----
From: Kelly Bishop [mailto:KBISHOP@kennesaw.Lawco.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2002 2:51 PM
To: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVN
Subject: Pelican Pier Questions

Hi Jason.

In completing the EA for Pelican Pier, we have generated a few questions:

1) Other activities in the area.... I know there is construction going on across the street from the pier, can you give us a few more details for the report?

2) The buildings on Chevron Park Drive (Blding #7400's) would you confirm that these are residential for me. In addition, what function

does blding #359 serve?

3) It does not appear that any prehistoric or Archeological sites are near the pier but, two descriptions are somewhat ambiguous. Would you agree with our assumption?

4) What is the Pier area Zoned?

Hope all is well!
k-

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR MOBILITY COMMAND

18 Dec 02

MEMORANDUM FOR LAW ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.
(ATTN: KELLY BISHOP)

FROM: HQ AMC/CEVP
507 Symington Drive
Scott AFB IL 62225-5022

SUBJECT: Review Comments for the Draft Environmental Assessment, Pelican Pier, MacDill AFB, FL (Your Memo, 7 Nov 02)

1. We appreciate the opportunity to review the subject document. The attached comment response matrix lists our comments.

2. If you have any questions, my point of contact is Mr. Doug Allbright, HQ AMC/CEVP, (618) 229-0846, e-mail: doug.allbright@scott.af.mil

//////SIGNED//////
DAVID L. CARLON, Lt Col, USAF
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch
Directorate of Civil Engineering

Attachment:
Comment Response Matrix


"Pelican Pier EA Comments.doc"

cc: 6 CES/CEV

Comment Response Matrix Review of Draft Environmental Assessment, Pelican Pier MacDill AFB, Florida		
Location	**Comment**	**Response**
Commenter: *(Maj Beller, AMC/CEVP, DSN 779-0841, Comm 618-229-0841)*		***Date: 17 Dec 02***
Para 1.1	This paragraph contains an outdated description of MacDill's mission. Please use your revised language for this paragraph.	
Para 1.5	Delete references to AFI 32-7061 and ensure 32 CFR 989 is used as the current guidance.	
Para 2.0	The descriptions of the proposed action and the replace in-kind alternative in paragraphs 2.0, 2.2, and 2.3 are confusing.	
Appendix A	Document not provided.	
Appendix B	Front page of AF Form 813 is missing.	
Appendix D	Public notice not provided.	

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR MOBILITY COMMAND

DEC 23 2003

18 DEC 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR LAW ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.
(ATTN: KELLY BISHOP)

FROM: HQ AMC/CEVP
507 Symington Drive
Scott AFB IL 62225-5022

SUBJECT: Review Comments for the Draft Environmental Assessment, Pelican Pier, MacDill AFB, FL (Your Memo, 7 Nov 02)

1. We appreciate the opportunity to review the subject document. The attached comment response matrix lists our comments.

2. If you have any questions, my point of contact is Mr. Doug Allbright, HQ AMC/CEVP, (618) 229-0846, e-mail: doug.allbright@scott.af.mil

DAVID L. CARLON, Lt Col, USAF
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch
Directorate of Civil Engineering

Attachment:
Comment Response Matrix

cc: 6 CES/CEV

Comment Response Matrix Review of Draft Environmental Assessment, Pelican Pier MacDill AFB, Florida		
Location	**Comment**	**Response**
Commenter: *(Maj Beller, AMC/CEVP, DSN 779-0841, Comm 618-229-0841)*		***Date: 17 Dec 02***
Para 1.1	This paragraph contains an outdated description of MacDill's mission. Please use your revised language for this paragraph.	
Para 1.5	Delete references to AFI 32-7061 and ensure 32 CFR 989 is used as the current guidance.	
Para 2.0	The descriptions of the proposed action and the replace in-kind alternative in paragraphs 2.0, 2.2, and 2.3 are confusing.	
Appendix A	Document not provided.	
Appendix B	Front page of AF Form 813 is missing.	
Appendix D	Public notice not provided.	

03 - 412

LAW

RESOURCES CREATING SOLUTIONS

MAR 10 2003

November 7, 2002

FWS Log. No. 03-412 (St. Pete)

The Proposed action is not likely to adversely affect resources protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). This finding fulfills the requirements of the Act.

With reference to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) the Service does not have sufficient staff to review and comment on this application; therefore, we are unable to make recommendations and take no action regarding this application.

for Candace Martino 3/5/03

Peter M. Benjamin
Assistant Field Supervisor

Date

Mr. Brian Pridgen
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
9549 Koger Boulevard, Suite 111
St. Petersburg, Florida 33702

Subject: **Draft Environmental Assessment**
Pelican Pier
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida
LAW Project 40140-2-0671-2

Dear Mr. Pridgen:

As authorized by the U.S. Air Force, LAW Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc. (LAW), a MACTEC, Inc. company, has completed the Draft Environmental Assessments (EA) for the referenced project at MacDill Air Force Base (AFB). The proposed project is the construction of a new pier and seawall, replacing the existing pier commonly known as Pelican Pier. The project would construct a new landing/docking facility on the east side of the Base for the 6th Security Forces Marine Patrol to stage their marine operations, and enforce the 1,000-yard coastal exclusion zone.

The EA describes the Proposed Action and alternatives (Chapter 2). It establishes baseline environmental conditions for the Base (Chapter 3) and evaluates the potential impacts associated with implementation of the Proposed Action and alternatives (Chapter 4). Resource areas discussed in the EA include air quality, noise, hazardous materials/waste and petroleum, floodplains, water, biological, socioeconomic, cultural, land-use, transportation, safety and occupational health, and environmental justice.

The EA meets the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for evaluation of impacts of a proposed action as part of the planning process. If the EA determines that no significant impacts would result from each Proposed Action, the Air Force will prepare a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for each project.

LAW Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc.
4919 W. Laurel Street
Tampa, FL 33607
813-289-0750 • Fax: 813-289-5474

Department of Environmental Protection

JAN 16 2003

Jeb Bush
Governor

Marjory Stoneman Douglas Building
3900 Commonwealth Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000

David B. Struhs
Secretary

January 13, 2003

Ms. Kelly Bishop
LAW Engineering & Environmental Services, Inc.
4919 West Laurel Street
Tampa, Florida 33607

RE: U. S. Air Force – Draft Environmental Assessment – Replacement of Pelican Pier, Construction of New Pier and Seawall – MacDill Air Force Base, Hillsborough County, Florida
SAI: FL200211143084C

Dear Ms. Bishop:

The Florida State Clearinghouse, pursuant to Executive Order 12372, Gubernatorial Executive Order 95-359, the Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1451-1464, as amended, and the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321, 4331-4335, 4341-4347, as amended, has coordinated a review of the referenced Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA).

Department (DEP) staff note that construction of the Proposed Action will require issuance of a standard general environmental resource permit (ERP) by the DEP Southwest District office in Tampa, pursuant to Chapter 373, *Florida Statutes*, and Rules 40D-4, 40D-40, and 62-330, *Florida Administrative Code*. Additional detailed project information and drawings may be required to fully evaluate the permit application. Based upon an evaluation of the functionality of the existing structures, the alternative proposal to replace Pelican Pier in-kind may qualify for an exemption from ERP permitting requirements. DEP also recommends that the project include the installation of rip-rap along the face of the new seawall to protect the structure and provide additional interstitial habitat for marine species.

Based on the information contained in the DEA and comments provided by our reviewing agencies, the state has determined that the subject action is consistent with the Florida Coastal Management Program.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Ms. Lauren P. Milligan at (850) 245-2163.

Sincerely,

Sally B. Mann

Sally B. Mann, Director
Office of Intergovernmental Programs

SBM/lm
Enclosures
cc: Brenda Arnold, DEP, Southwest District
Jason Kirkpatrick, MacDill AFB

DIVISIONS OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Office of the Secretary
Office of International Relations
Division of Elections
Division of Corporations
Division of Cultural Affairs
Division of Historical Resources
Division of Library and Information Services
Division of Licensing
Division of Administrative Services

MEMBER OF THE FLORIDA CABINET
State Board of Education
Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund
Administration Commission
Florida Land and Water Adjudicatory Commission
Siting Board
Division of Bond Finance
Department of Revenue
Department of Law Enforcement
Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles
Department of Veterans' Affairs

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Jim Smith
Secretary of State
DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Ms. Kelly Bishop
LAW Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc.
4919 W. Laurel Street
Tampa, Florida 33607

November 14, 2002

RE: DHR Project File No. 2002-10646
Received by DHR November 8, 2002
Draft Environmental Assessment – MacDill Air Force Base Pelican Pier
LAW Project #40140-2-0671-2
MacDill AFB, Hillsborough County, Florida

Dear Ms. Bishop:

Our office received and reviewed the above referenced project in accordance with Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966*, as amended and *36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties* and the *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.* The State Historic Preservation Officer is to advise Federal agencies as they identify historic properties (listed or eligible for listing, in the *National Register of Historic Places*), assess effects upon them, and consider alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse effects.

Based on a review of sections 3.8 and 4.8, both dealing with Cultural Resources, this office concurs with your finding that no historic properties will be affected by this undertaking.

If you have any questions concerning our comments, please contact Scott Edwards, Historic Preservation Planner, by electronic mail *sedwards@mail.dos.state.fl.us*, or at 850-245-6333 or 800-847-7278.

Sincerely,

Janet Snyder Matthews, Ph.D., Director, and
State Historic Preservation Officer

COUNTY: HILLSBOROUGH

Message:

DATE: 11/13/02
COMMENTS DUE DATE: 12/14/02
CLEARANCE DUE DATE: 1/12/03
SAI#: FL200211143084C

STATE AGENCIES	WATER MNGMNT. DISTRICTS	OPB POLICY UNITS
X COMMUNITY AFFAIRS FISH and WILDLIFE COMMISSION STATE TRANSPORTATION ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WMD	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY UNIT

RECEIVED
NOV 20 2002
DEPT. OF COMM. AFFAIRS/DCP

The attached document requires a Coastal Zone Management Act/Florida Coastal Management Program consistency evalutation and is categorized as one of the following:

— Federal Assistance to State or Local Government (15 CFR 930, Subpart F). Agencies are required to evaluate the consistency of the activity.

X Direct Federal Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart C). Federal Agencies are required to furnish a consistency determination for the State's concurrence or objection.

— Outer Continental Shelf Exploration, Development or Production Activities (15 CFR 930, Subpart E). Operators are required to provide a consistency certification for state concurrence/objection.

— Federal Licensing or Permitting Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart D). Such projects will only be evaluated for consistency when there is not an analogous state license or permit.

Project Description:

U.S. Air Force - Draft Environmental Assessment - Replacement of Pelican Pier - Construction of New Pier and Seawall - MacDill Air Force Base - LAW Project 40140-2-0671-2 - November 2002 - Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida.

RECEIVED
NOV 21 2002
OIP/OLGA

To: **Florida State Clearinghouse**
AGENCY CONTACT AND COORDINATOR (SCH)
2555 SHUMARD OAK BLVD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-2100
(850) 414-6580 (SC 994-6580)
(850) 414-0479

EO. 12372/NEPA
- [x] No Comment
- [ ] Comment Attached
- [ ] Not Applicable

Federal Consistency
- [ ] No Comment/Consistent
- [ ] Consistent/Comments Attached
- [ ] Inconsistent/Comments Attached
- [ ] Not Applicable

From:
Division/Bureau: DCA/DCP
Reviewer:
Date: 11/21/02

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

User: Lauren Milligan, , ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Project Information

Project:	FL200211143084C
Description:	U.S. Air Force - Draft Environmental Assessment - Replacement of Pelican Pier - Construction of New Pier and Seawall - MacDill Air Force Base - LAW Project 40140-2-0671-2 - November 2002 - Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida.
Keywords:	USAF - DEA - Replacement of Pelican Pier - MacDill
Program:	

Review Comments

Reviewer:	FISH and WILDLIFE COMMISSION
Date:	11/25/2002
Description:	NC by Brian Barnett
Comment Type:	○ Draft ◉ Final

DIVISIONS OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Office of the Secretary
Office of International Relations
Division of Elections
Division of Corporations
Division of Cultural Affairs
Division of Historical Resources
Division of Library and Information Services
Division of Licensing
Division of Administrative Services

MEMBER OF THE FLORIDA CABINET
State Board of Education
Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund
Administration Commission
Florida Land and Water Adjudicatory Commission
Siting Board
Division of Bond Finance
Department of Revenue
Department of Law Enforcement
Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles
Department of Veterans' Affairs

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Jim Smith
Secretary of State
DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

December 11, 2002

Ms. Cindy Cranick
Florida State Clearinghouse Coordinator
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, Mail Station 47
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000

RE: DHR No. 2002-10903 / Received by DHR: November 20, 2002
SAI #: 200211143084C / Law Project 40140-2-0671-2
Draft Environmental Assessment – Replacement of Pelican Pier, MacDill Air Force Base
Hillsborough County, Florida

Dear Ms. Cranick:

Our office received and reviewed the above referenced project in accordance with Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966* (Public Law 89-665), as amended in 1992, and *36 C.F.R., Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties*. The State Historic Preservation Officer is to advise Federal agencies when identifying historic properties (listed or eligible for listing, in the *National Register of Historic Places*), assessing effects upon them, and considering alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse effects.

We have reviewed sections 3.8and 4.8, both dealing with Cultural Resources, of the referenced environmental assessment. Based on the information provided, it is the opinion of this office that the proposed undertaking will have no effect on historic properties.

If there are any questions concerning our comments or recommendations, please contact Sarah Jalving, Historic Sites Specialist, by electronic mail at sjalving@mail.dos.state.fl.us or at 850-245-6333 or SunCom 205-6333. Thank you for your interest in protecting Florida's historic properties.

Sincerely,

Frederick P. Gaske, Deputy SHPO

for Janet Snyder Matthews, Ph.D., Director, and
State Historic Preservation Officer

COUNTY: HILLSBOROUGH

DATE: 11/13/02
COMMENTS DUE DATE: 12/14/02
CLEARANCE DUE DATE: 1/12/03
SAI#: FL200211143084C

Message:

STATE AGENCIES	WATER MNGMNT. DISTRICTS	OPB POLICY UNITS
COMMUNITY AFFAIRS FISH and WILDLIFE COMMISSION STATE X TRANSPORTATION ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WMD	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY UNIT

The attached document requires a Coastal Zone Management Act/Florida Coastal Management Program consistency evalutation and is categorized one of the following:

— Federal Assistance to State or Local Government (15 CFR 930, Subpart F). Agencies are required to evaluate the consistency of the activity.

X Direct Federal Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart C). Federal Agencies are required to furnish a consistency determination for the State's concurrence or objection.

— Outer Continental Shelf Exploration, Development or Production Activities (15 CFR 930, Subpart E). Operators are required to provide a consistency certification for state concurrence/objection.

— Federal Licensing or Permitting Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart D). Such projects will only be evaluated for consistency when there is not an analogous state license or permit.

Project Description:

U.S. Air Force - Draft Environmental Assessment - Replacement of Pelican Pier - Construction of New Pier and Seawall - MacDill Air Force Base - LAW Project 40140-2-0671-2 - November 2002 - Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida.

To: Florida State Clearinghouse
AGENCY CONTACT AND COORDINATOR (SCH)
2555 SHUMARD OAK BLVD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-2100
(850) 414-6580 (SC 994-6580)
(850) 414-0479

EO. 12372/NEPA
☒ No Comment
☐ Comment Attached
☐ Not Applicable

Federal Consistency
☒ No Comment/Consistent
☐ Consistent/Comments Attached
☐ Inconsistent/Comments Attached
☐ Not Applicable

From:
Division/Bureau: FDOT D-7 Modal Planning + Dev.
Reviewer: Robin Rhinesmith
Date: 12-3-02

Southwest Florida
Water Management District

2379 Broad Street, Brooksville, Florida 34604-6899
(352) 796-7211 or 1-800-423-1476 (FL only)
SUNCOM 628-4150 TDD only 1-800-231-6103 (FL only)
On the Internet at: WaterMatters.org

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Tampa Service Office
7601 Highway 301 North
Tampa, Florida 33637-6759
(813) 985-7481 or
1-800-836-0797 (FL only)
SUNCOM 578-2070

Bartow Service Office
170 Century Boulevard
Bartow, Florida 33830-7700
(863) 534-1448 or
1-800-492-7862 (FL only)
SUNCOM 572-6200

Sarasota Service Office
6750 Fruitville Road
Sarasota, Florida 34240-9711
(941) 377-3722 or
1-800-320-3503 (FL only)
SUNCOM 531-6900

Lecanto Service Office
3600 West Sovereign Path
Suite 226
Lecanto, Florida 34461-8070
(352) 527-8131
SUNCOM 667-3271

December 17, 2002

Ms. Cindy Cranick
Florida State Clearinghouse
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, Mail Station 47
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000

Subject: **U.S. Air Force-Draft Environmental Assessment-Replacement of Pelican Pier-Construction of New Pier and Seawall-MacDill Air Force Base-LAW Project 40140-2-0671-2-November, 2000-Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida; SAI#: FL200211143084C**

Dear Ms. Cranick:

The staff of the Southwest Florida Water Management District (District) has conducted a consistency evaluation for the referenced project. Consistency findings are divided into four categories and are based solely on the information provided in the subject application.

FINDING	CATEGORY
X	Consistent/No Comment
	Consistent/Comments Attached
	Inconsistent/Comments Attached
	Consistency Cannot be Determined Without an Environmental Assessment Report/Comments Attached

The District appreciates the opportunity to participate in the review of this application. Please be advised that our review does not constitute permit approval under Chapter 373, Florida Statutes, or any rules promulgated thereunder, nor does it stand in lieu of normal permitting procedures in accordance with Florida Statutes and District rules.

If you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance, please contact me in the District's Planning Department.

Sincerely,

Trisha Neasman

Trisha Neasman, AICP
Government Planning Coordinator

FLORIDA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COORDINATION
ROUTING SHEET

SAI#: FL200211143084C DATE: 11/13/02

COMMENTS DUE TO RPC: 12/5/02

AREA OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY: COUNTY: **HILLSBOROUGH** CITY: **Tampa**

☐ FEDERAL ASSISTANCE ☒ DIRECT FEDERAL ACTIVITY ☐ FEDERAL LICENSE OR PERMIT ☐ OCS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

U.S. Air Force - Draft Environmental Assessment - Replacement of Pelican Pier - Construction of New Pier and Seawall - MacDill Air Force Base - LAW Project 40140-2-0671-2 - November 2002 - Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida.

ROUTING:

RPC	Local Governments
___TAMPA BAY RPC	X HILLSBOROUGH
	TAMPA

IF YOU HAVE NO COMMENTS, PLEASE CHECK HERE AND RETURN FORM TO RPC : ✓

ALL CONCERNS OR COMMENTS REGARDING THE ATACHED PROJECT SHOULD BE SENT IN WRITING BY THE DUE DATE TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCILSHOWN BELOW. PLEASE REFER TO THE SAI # IN ALL CORRESPONDENCE:

Ms. ANGELA HURLEY
9455 KOGER BOULEVARD
SUITE 219
ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA 337022491

IMPORTANT: PLEASE DO NOT SEND COMMENTS DIRECTLY TO THE CLEARINGHOUSE!

IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS REGARDING THE ATTACHED PROJECT OR THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION PROCESS, PLEASE CONTACT THE STATE CLEARINGHOUSE. IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS REGARDING THE FEDERAL CONSISTENCY REVIEW PROCESS, PLEASE CONTACT THE FLORIDA COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM. THE TELEPHONE NUMBER FOR BOTH PROGRAMS IS (850) 414-6580 OR SUNCOM 994-6580.

FLORIDA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COORDINATION
ROUTING SHEET

SAI#: FL200211143084C DATE: 11/13/02

COMMENTS DUE TO RPC: 12/5/02

AREA OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY: COUNTY: HILLSBOROUGH CITY: Tampa

[ ] FEDERAL ASSISTANCE [X] DIRECT FEDERAL ACTIVITY [ ] FEDERAL LICENSE OR PERMIT [ ] OCS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

U.S. Air Force - Draft Environmental Assessment - Replacement of Pelican Pier - Construction of New Pier and Seawall - MacDill Air Force Base - LAW Project 40140-2-0671-2 - November 2002 - Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida.

ROUTING:

RPC

___TAMPA BAY RPC

Local Governments

HILLSBOROUGH

X TAMPA

RECEIVED
NOV 25 2002
Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council

IF YOU HAVE NO COMMENTS, PLEASE CHECK HERE AND RETURN FORM TO RPC : ✓

ALL CONCERNS OR COMMENTS REGARDING THE ATACHED PROJECT SHOULD BE SENT IN WRITING BY THE DUE DATE TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCILSHOWN BELOW. PLEASE REFER TO THE SAI # IN ALL CORRESPONDENCE:

Ms. ANGELA HURLEY
9455 KOGER BOULEVARD
SUITE 219
ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA 337022491

IMPORTANT: PLEASE DO NOT SEND COMMENTS DIRECTLY TO THE CLEARINGHOUSE!

IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS REGARDING THE ATTACHED PROJECT OR THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION PROCESS, PLEASE CONTACT THE STATE CLEARINGHOUSE. IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS REGARDING THE FEDERAL CONSISTENCY REVIEW PROCESS, PLEASE CONTACT THE FLORIDA COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM. THE TELEPHONE NUMBER FOR BOTH PROGRAMS IS (850) 414-6580 OR SUNCOM 994-6580.

APPENDIX C

AIR EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS FOR PROPOSED ACTION AND CUMMULATIVE AIR EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS

TABLE 4A
Total Air Emissions for Projects at MacDill

Pollutants	*Pelican Pier*	Naval Reserve Center	Mission Planning Center	Control Tower/ Crash Rescue	Dog Kennel/ Demo	Entry Gates	SVS Storage Facility/ Demo	CENT. Wall & Parking Lots	War Res. Facility	Hydrant Fueling System	Military Service Station	Runway Pavement Repairs	Project Totals	Hills Cty Emissions 1997	Net Change	De minimis	Above/Below De minimis
CO	2.55	6.77	7.20	5.39	2.71	2.55	5.40	0.21	0.81	30.97	0.11	2.60	**67.27**	19,272	0.35%	100	Below
VOC	1.40	3.40	3.59	2.81	1.76	1.94	2.81	0.3	0.61	10.38	0.21	1.88	**31.09**	27,703	0.11%	100	Below
NO_X	3.37	7.59	8.74	6.09	3.06	3.96	6.11	0.96	0.94	33.84	0.24	12.02	**86.92**	82,563	0.11%	100	Below
SO_X	0.18	0.37	0.44	0.3	0.15	0.22	0.3	0.06	0.05	1.64	0.01	0.80	**4.52**	NA		100	Below
PM_{10}	0.33	0.60	0.78	0.49	0.25	0.45	0.49	0.17	0.08	2.57	0.04	2.10	**8.35**	NA		100	Below
Pb													**0**	53		25	Below
Estimated Start/End Date	9/2003 to 3/2004	4/2003 to 10/2004	1/2002 to 6/2003	3/2003 to 9/2004	6/2003 to 6/2004	3/2003 to 12/2004	5/2002 to 5/2003	8/2002 to 4/2003	8/2001 to 6/2002	8/2001 to 1/2004	6/2002 to 6/2003	10/2001 to 3/2004					

**Note: All values in tons per year unless otherwise noted.
Net change = Project totals / Hills County emissions
Above/Below De minimis = Project totals above or below de minimis
NA = not available.

YEAR 2002, 2003 & 2004 EMISSIONS WERE CALCULATED BY TAKING AN APPROPRIATE PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL EMISSIONS DETERMINED ABOVE. SEE TABLES 4B and 4D BELOW

TABLE 4B
Emissions for Year 2002

		Pelican Pier	Naval Reserve Center	Mission Planning Center	Control Tower/ Crash Rescue	Dog Kennel/ Demo	Entry Gates	CE Storage Facility	SVS Storage Facility	War Res. Facility	Hydrant Fueling System	Military Service Station	Runway Pavement Repairs	2002 Project Totals	De minimis	Above/Below De minimis
Estimated % of Time During 2002 That Project Would Be Active		**0%**	**0%**	**100%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**91%**	**58%**	**50%**	**100%**	**50%**	**100%**			
	Pollutants															
	CO	0.00	0.00	7.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.32	3.13	0.41	30.97	0.06	2.60	**46.68**	100	Below
	VOC	0.00	0.00	3.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.77	1.63	0.31	10.38	0.11	1.88	**19.66**	100	Below
	NO_X	0.00	0.00	8.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.60	3.54	0.47	33.84	0.12	12.02	**62.34**	100	Below
	SO_X	0.00	0.00	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.17	0.03	1.64	0.01	0.80	**3.28**	100	Below
	PM_{10}	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.28	0.04	2.57	0.02	2.10	**6.20**	100	Below
	Pb													**0**	25	Below

TABLE 4C
Emissions for Year 2003

		Pelican Pier	Naval Reserve Center	Mission Planning Center	Control Tower/ Crash Rescue	Dog Kennel/ Demo	Entry Gates	CE Storage Facility	SVS Storage Facility	War Res. Facility	Hydrant Fueling System	Military Service Station	Runway Pavement Repairs	2003 Project Totals	De minimis	Above/Below De minimis
Estimated % of Time During 2003 That Project Would Be Active		**25%**	**50%**	**50%**	**75%**	**50%**	**50%**	**0%**	**42%**	**0%**	**100%**	**50%**	**100%**			
	Pollutants															
	CO	0.64	3.39	3.60	4.04	1.36	0.11	0.00	2.27	0.00	30.97	0.06	2.60	**49.02**	100	Below
	VOC	0.35	1.70	1.80	2.11	0.88	0.15	0.00	1.18	0.00	10.38	0.11	1.88	**20.53**	100	Below
	NO_X	0.84	3.80	4.37	4.57	1.53	0.48	0.00	2.57	0.00	33.84	0.12	12.02	**64.13**	100	Below
	SO_X	0.05	0.19	0.22	0.23	0.08	0.03	0.00	0.13	0.00	1.64	0.01	0.80	**3.35**	100	Below
	PM_{10}	0.08	0.30	0.39	0.37	0.13	0.09	0.00	0.21	0.00	2.57	0.02	2.10	**6.25**	100	Below
	Pb													**0**	25	Below

TABLE 4D
Emissions for Year 2004

		Pelican Pier	Naval Reserve Center	Mission Planning Center	Control Tower/ Crash Rescue	Dog Kennel/ Demo	Entry Gates	CE Storage Facility	SVS Storage Facility	War Res. Facility	Hydrant Fueling System	Military Service Station	Runway Pavement Repairs	2004 Project Totals	De minimis	Above/Below De minimis
Estimated % of Time During 2004 That Project Would Be Active		**25%**	**50%**	**0%**	**75%**	**50%**	**100%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**8%**	**0%**	**25%**			
	Pollutants															
	CO	0.64	3.39	0.00	4.04	1.36	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.48	0.00	0.65	**12.76**	100	Below
	VOC	0.35	1.70	0.00	2.11	0.88	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.83	0.00	0.47	**6.64**	100	Below
	NO_X	0.84	3.80	0.00	4.57	1.53	0.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.71	0.00	3.01	**17.41**	100	Below
	SO_X	0.05	0.19	0.00	0.23	0.08	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.20	**0.92**	100	Below
	PM_{10}	0.08	0.30	0.00	0.37	0.13	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.53	**1.78**	100	Below
	Pb													**0**	25	Below

TABLE 4E - CONSTRUCTION SITE AIR EMISSIONS
PELICAN PIER
Combustive Emissions of ROG, NOx, SO2, CO and PM10 Due to Construction

May-03

Input:

Total Building Area:	11,167	ft^2	(calculation: Pier @ 6,400 sq. ft
Total Paved Area:	7,000	ft^2	new seawall @ 2,190 sq. ft (730 LF X 3' wide)
Total Disturbed Area:	4.0	acres	= 8,590 sq. ft X 1.3 (margins of area) = 11,167 SF)
Construction Duration:	0.5	years	
Annual Construction Activity:	130	days/yr	

Results:[Average per Year Over the Construction Period]

	ROG	NOx	SO2	CO	PM10
Emissions, lbs/day	21.59	51.82	2.73	39.19	5.10
Emissions, tons/yr	1.40	3.37	0.18	2.55	0.33

Calculation of Unmitigated Emissions

Summary of Input Parameters

	ROG	NOx	SO2	CO	PM10
Total new acres disturbed:	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Total new acres paved:	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
Total new building space, ft^2:	11,167	11,167	11,167	11,167	11,167
Total years:	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Area graded, acres in 1 yr:	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00
Area paved, acres in 1 yr:	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32
Building space, ft^2 in 1 yr:	22,334	22,334	22,334	22,334	22,334

Annual Emissions by Source (lbs/day)

	ROG	NOx	SO2	CO	PM10
Grading Equipment	2.0	12.8	0.9	2.8	2.2
Asphalt Paving	0.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stationary Equipment	3.8	3.1	0.2	0.7	0.2
Mobile Equipment	3.6	36.0	1.7	35.8	2.7
Architectural Coatings (Non-Res)	12.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Emissions (lbs/day):	21.59	51.82	2.73	39.19	5.10

Emission Factors
Reference: Air Quality Thresholds of Significance, SMAQMD, 1994.

Source	SMAQMD Emission Factor				
	ROG	NOx	SO2 *	CO *	PM10
Grading Equipment	2.50E-01 lbs/acre/day	1.60E+00 lbs/acre/day	0.11 lbs/acre/day	0.35 lbs/acre/day	2.80E-01 lbs/acre/day
Asphalt Paving	2.62E-01 lbs/acre/day	NA	NA	NA	NA
Stationary Equipment	1.68E-04 lbs/day/ft^2	1.37E-04 lbs/day/ft^2	9.11E-06 lbs/day/ft^2	2.97E-05 lbs/day/ft^2	8.00E-06 lbs/day/ft^2
Mobile Equipment	1.60E-04 lbs/day/ft^2	1.61E-03 lbs/day/ft^2	7.48E-05 lbs/day/ft^2	0.0016 lbs/day/ft^2	1.20E-04 lbs/day/ft^2
Architectural Coatings (Non-Res)	8.15E-02 lbs/day/ft	NA	NA	NA	NA

* Factors for grading equipment and stationary equipment are calculated from AP-42 for diesel engines using ratios with the NOx factors.
Factors for mobile equipment are calculated from ratios with Mobile5a 2001 NOx emission factors for heavy duty trucks for each site.